
TWO LETTERS

IN REPLY TO

CERTAIN PUBLICATIONS OF THE

REV. DR. SAMUEL MILLER,

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE
PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AT PRINCETON, N. J.

BY GEORGE WELLER, D. D.

RECTOR OF CHRIST CHURCH, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.
DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter.....

No.....

March 15th 1855.

BV 670 .W4 1836

Weller, George, 1790-1841.

Two letters in reply to
certain publications of the





TWO



LETTERS

IN REPLY TO

CERTAIN PUBLICATIONS OF THE

REV. DR. SAMUEL MILLER,

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE
PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AT PRINCETON, N. J.

BY GEORGE WELLER, D. D.

RECTOR OF CHRIST CHURCH, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

NASHVILLE:

.....
1836.



A LETTER

TO THE EDITORS OF THE

NASHVILLE

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN;

CONTAINING

AN EXAMINATION OF THE REASONS FOR

“REJECTING EPISCOPACY,”

WRITTEN

BY DR. MILLER,

AND

REPUBLISHED IN SEVERAL LATE NUMBERS

OF THAT PAPER.

BY AN EPISCOPALIAN.

Nashville,

PRINTED BY W. HASELL HUNT & CO.

1835.

A LETTER, &c.

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON

THEOLOGICAL

SEMINARY

Your paper purports to be conducted by *an association of gentlemen*: as I am, however, wholly ignorant as to who are the individual members of that association, no part of these strictures is to be taken with a personal application.

In the numbers of the American Presbyterian for May 21, 28, and June 4th, under the head of *Religious*, are several columns of matter purporting to be part of a work by Samuel Miller, D. D., *on the truly primitive and apostolical constitution of the Church of Christ*. The 4th chapter, which you profess to extract, is stated to be entitled "*on the government of the PRESBYTERIAN Church*."

In our happy country, every man is perfectly free to hold and maintain any principles which may seem to him to be right, provided he concedes to others the same privilege, and does not disturb them in the peaceful exercise of their own opinions. So far, therefore, as Dr. Miller, and you gentlemen, have chosen to state and vindicate your own opinions in relation to the ecclesiastical principles which prevail in your own church, instead of having any censure to bestow upon you, I would rather commend your zeal: Those opinions, on any subject, must have small claim to public and general adoption, which those who hold them fear to bring to light. I have no such fears with regard to the claims of the Episcopal Church, of which I am a humble member; and it is because you have chosen, without provocation, while professing merely to defend Presbyterianism, to show reasons why you, in the fulness of your elevation, are pleased to *reject prelacy*; or, in other

words, the ecclesiastical principles of your "Episcopal brethren," that I desire your attention to the following pages.

I include *you* in the application of these strictures, because the statements which you have borrowed from Dr. Miller respecting Episcopacy, at least in the spirit in which he has made them, were, if information to the members of your own church on the subject of its government, was all that was intended, nowise necessary, even to the subject itself: Yet, while those who profess to receive *Episcopacy* as the primitive and apostolic government of the church of Christ, are few in number, and living in peace by your side, you have chosen to avail yourselves of his labors to *misrepresent their principles*, and *deny their claims to scriptural sanction* for institutions, which, as will be shown, even some of your own side have admitted to be coeval, or nearly so, with the apostles themselves; and because, moreover, you have thus unwittingly perhaps, become sponsors for the long continued and vehement animosity of Dr Miller towards the Episcopal Church; which may well, in my judgment, be compared with that feeling of the Romans against Carthage, which produced the well known declaration, *Delenda est Carthago!*

I purpose, in the following remarks, simply to repel, with what ability I may, your unprovoked assault upon the Episcopal Church—your reasons for *rejecting* prelacy. It is not my intention to copy the example you have set me, by any animadversions whatever upon the doctrines or discipline of your own church. I am no assailant. I am acting wholly and strictly on the defensive.

Before proceeding to an examination of Dr. M's allegations, the position in which he has, for many years past, placed himself in relation to the Episcopal church, demands some attention to his claims in regard to *authority* and *veracity*.

Dr. M. has been repeatedly, by Dr. Bowden, Dr. Cooke, and other writers, publicly charged with misrepresenting the opinions of the authors whom he quotes—with misquoting

their language—with omitting, in the midst of passages quoted, expressions, differing entirely from the tenor he has given to the passage, and from his own opinions—with substituting expressions, which would serve his purpose, in quotations, for those which would not. Some proofs of the correctness of these charges will be furnished in the following pages, and more can be adduced should they be thought necessary.

In a late work, Dr M., for what *religious* purpose it is not easy to conceive, asserted that a clergyman had been driven out of the Episcopal church for not believing in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. It was soon ascertained what clergyman was referred to; and the correspondence between him and his bishop having been published, it appeared, what was well known previously to all who had any interest in the matter, (which Dr. M. certainly had not) that his renunciation of the ministry was *voluntary* on the part of the clergyman; and was occasioned by entirely different circumstances from those, which Dr. M. in his zealous care for another church than his own, was pleased to assign!

In the same work, Dr. Miller undertook to discuss, for the purpose of *condemning*, the principles and usages of the Episcopal church, in regard to baptism. Absurdly enough, he there actually condemns the Episcopal church for *not* holding a doctrine, which is plainly asserted in some of the plainest passages, of its book of Common Prayer! The Editor of the *Philadelphia Episcopal Recorder* says of this matter, that “Dr. M. has certainly presented statements on the subject which an hour’s examination of the Prayer Book would have satisfied him to be incorrect.—How much is it to be regretted that he did not take the pains to ascertain correctly the language of *the only quotation* which he adduces from the Prayer Book, or elsewhere, in confirmation of his statements.—Alas, that Dr. Miller should have been so ready to advance objections to a church of whose peculiarities he is *so inexcusably ignorant.*”

It is now about twenty years since Dr. M. published a work, entitled, *Letters on the Christian Ministry*, of which a new edition has been published within the last 4 or 5 years. Some years after the first edition of this work appeared, he published another work, entitled *Letters on Unitarianism*. In the first of these works he speaks thus of Ignatius, one of the *fathers* of the primitive church, whom he also quotes in his attack on Episcopacy in your paper: "That even the *shorter epistles* of Ignatius are unworthy of confidence as the genuine works of the *father* whose name they bear, is the opinion of some of the ablest and best judges of the Protestant world." *Letters on the Ministry*, first ed. p. 140.—But when he came to write his *Letters on Unitarianism*, he had discovered that Ignatius could yield him some support, and he therefore speaks as follows of the identical work, which, in the extract above, he considered *unworthy of confidence*: "The great body of learned men consider the *smaller epistles* of Ignatius, as, in the main, the real works of the writer whose name they bear." p. 122.—This might be taken to indicate a serious and deliberate change of opinion, deserving commendation rather than censure; but lo! when a new edition of the *Letters on the Ministry* was to be published, after a careful revision and correction, both of language and sentiments, the original declaration in relation to Ignatius, that his epistles were regarded by the ablest and best judges of the Protestant world as *unworthy* of confidence, had again become the ruling opinion; and now, once more, when, as in the extract in your paper, Ignatius could be made to serve a turn, he becomes, in Dr. M's opinion, again worthy of confidence! Whether, after these statements, which any one may verify, Dr. Miller is himself to be considered by the world, learned and unlearned, an authority on subjects of this nature; or even worthy of confidence, is left for those who may read these strictures to judge.

And now a word in regard to the title of Dr. Miller's work.

from which your extracts are made. An individual who was desirous, for certain reasons, of attracting particular attention, to his place of business, put over his door a *beehive*, as an emblem of his industry in his profession, and as a sign to those who might be directed to his establishment. One of his neighbors seeing, or thinking that he saw, that his brother tradesman was deriving advantage by this means, erected over his door also, a beehive, with the inscription, *the original bee-hive*. The object was understood, and a third individual resolved that he would participate also in the trade which the beehive had attracted to the vicinage; accordingly a third beehive was soon seen glittering with gold, and bearing the yet more attractive label, *the true original beehive!* I leave the application of this anecdote, to those who have read, or may read, the mass of assertion and invective, to which Dr. Miller has given the title of *the truly primitive, &c.*

Dr. Miller and the editors of the American Presbyterian say "*We reject the claims of Prelacy*"—in other words, you favor your "Episcopal brethren" so far as to tell us that you *reject* Episcopacy! You then give us an unexceptionable statement of the received doctrine of Episcopacy, and add, "*to no part of this claim*"—that is, the claim of Episcopalians that their church constitution is primitive and apostolic—"does the New Testament afford the least countenance."—You say that Episcopacy is "*a usurpation for which there is not the smallest warrant in the word of God:*"—that "*there is not the semblance of support to be found in Scripture for the alleged transmission of the pre-eminent and peculiar power of the apostles to a set of ecclesiastical successors:*"—that "*when we ask the advocates of Episcopacy whence they derive their favorite doctrine, that diocesan bishops succeed the apostles in the appropriate powers and pre-eminence of their apostolic character, they refer us to no passages of Scripture asserting or even hinting it:*"—that—"it is not so much as pretended that a passage is to be found, which gives a hint of this kind:"

The plain meaning of these assertions is, that, in the opinion of Dr. Miller, and the editors of the American Presbyterian, *Episcopalians not only cannot find any countenance in Scripture for their doctrine of the constitution of the Christian ministry, but they do not even make pretensions to do so.* If these gentlemen have truth on their side, the large majority of Protestant divines have been sadly mistaken, or something worse; and the Episcopal Church is certainly not entitled to the ground she has long held among a vast multitude of the excellent of the earth!

And yet, as long ago as the *Reformation*, amidst hazards on all sides, such as we, of this age, are unable adequately to conceive, the English Reformers, with *Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley* at their head; rejecting, at the risk of their lives, every thing in religion which could not be sanctioned by the *written word of God*, announced and persevered in their adherence to Episcopacy as the primitive and apostolic constitution of the church of Christ! In the preface to their *Ordinal*, (or forms of ordination) they declared, that, "It is evident to all men, diligently reading *Holy Scripture* and ancient authors, that, from the apostles' times, there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, *Bishops, Priests and Deacons.*"—They could, in some of the most solemn acts of their religion appeal to Almighty God to witness, that by his "divine Providence," and "by his Holy Spirit" he had "appointed *divers* orders of ministers in his church,"—that he had "*inspired* his apostles to choose into the order of *deacons*, the first martyr St. Stephen, with others," and yet not believe—according to Dr Miller—that they derived any countenance for these facts from Scripture! So anxious were the authors of these expressions, that every thing connected with religion should be brought to the test of Scripture, that they were the first in all the world to cause the Bible to be translated into their own language, and placed within the reach of all who could read: and yet they did not believe, it seems—if we are to credit Dr.

Miller—that the stations they held in the Church, the ministrations they performed, and the principles they avowed and practised, received any countenance from the New Testament! And can Dr. Miller induce you, Messrs. Editors, in these days of light, and knowledge, and common sense, to believe such a wonderful tale as this?

And now, gentlemen, to make a long story short,—for your patience would be exhausted long before I could complete the mound of evidence which I might heap up in this case,—we will, if you please, take it for granted, that Episcopalians have, from the time of the Reformation, continued to believe, that the Episcopal constitution is sanctioned by Scripture; for they have continued with possibly some variations of opinion among individuals, substantially to maintain and act upon these same *doctrines of the Reformation* on this subject; for they have, at least, in the published formularies of their Church, and in every case of ordination to the ministry, whether of bishop, priest, or deacon, continued to make the same appeals; and have moreover constantly declared in their Ordinal, in the language which *the martyrs of the Reformation* themselves placed there, that “no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, priest, or deacon in this church, or suffered to execute any of its functions, except he hath had Episcopal consecration, or ordination.”

But, at the very time that Dr. Miller made his singularly bold declaration, that when the advocates of Episcopacy are asked whence they derive their favorite doctrine, “they refer us to no passages of Scripture asserting, or even hinting it; but to some equivocal suggestions and allusions of several Fathers, who wrote within the first four or five hundred years after Christ,” he certainly had before him, for he quotes it just before, a little work by Bishop Onderdonk of Pennsylvania; which he could not but know, is extensively approved of among Episcopalians, in this country; with the very title, *Episcopacy tested by Scripture!* From the first page of this

work, I quote the following as a point blank contradiction of Dr. Miller's assertion.

"The claim of episcopacy to be of divine institution, and therefore obligatory on the Church, rests fundamentally on the one question-- has it the authority of Scripture? If it has not, it is not necessarily binding. If it has, the next and only other question is--has any different arrangement of the sacred ministry scriptural authority? If there be any such, that also has divine sanction, and must stand with episcopacy. If, however none such can be found, then episcopacy *alone* has the countenance of the word of GOD."

"Such a statement of the essential point of the episcopal controversy is entirely simple; and this one point should be kept in view in every discussion of the subject; no argument is worth taking into account that has not a palpable bearing on the clear and naked topic--the scriptural evidence of episcopacy."*

* I am not ignorant that this work of Bp. Onderdonk's has received a professed answer from the Rev. Mr. Barnes of Philadelphia. The following extract from the New York *Churchman* of the 6th instant, will serve to show in what light this answer is regarded by Episcopalians. "A writer in the Episcopal Recorder suggests the propriety of publishing the tract of Bp. Onderdonk on Episcopacy, and the review of it by Mr. Barnes, as containing the best discussion of the Scriptural argument for Episcopacy. It is admitted by all that the controversy has been conducted with much ability, and in a proper spirit by both parties, and we doubt not the publication proposed would essentially promote the cause of truth. We are happy to say that the whole controversy is now publishing by the Protestant Episcopal Tract Society of this city. (New York) The work will be stereotyped, and will contain the original tract by Bp. O., --the review by Mr. Barnes, --Bp. O's. reply to the review, and Mr. B's. rejoinder, with the conclusion by Bp. O. An article on the same subject, from the Biblical Repertory, at Princeton, with Bp. O's. reply, will also form part of the same volume. Thus the subject of *Episcopacy tested by Scripture*, will be laid fully and fairly before the public. Episcopalians are entirely and universally satisfied with the manner in which Bp. O. has conducted the argument. Presbyterians too, are satisfied, inas-

It would swell these strictures to a very inconvenient length to adduce all the Scripture testimony which Episcopalians are accustomed, openly and freely, in books and conversation, to appeal to on this subject; testimony which Dr. Miller, notwithstanding his assertions, has read and heard on very many occasions. In addition to the following brief statement, I refer those who may desire a full acquaintance with it to Bp. Onderdonk's work, above named.

I must here avail myself, however, of a rule which Dr. Miller has himself laid down in the first edition of his *Letters on the Christian Ministry*, p. 26-27, on this subject.—Speaking of the ministry, he says, “It is proper to premise, that whoever expects to find any *formal* or *explicit* declarations on this subject, delivered by Christ or his apostles, will be disappointed.—While the Scriptures present *no formal or explicit directions* on this subject, we find in them *a mode of expression*, and *a number of facts*, from which we may, *without difficulty*, ascertain the outlines of the apostolic plan of church order.” I trust this will be a sufficient bar in my favor against the operation of his assertion, in this IVth chapter now before us, that “*the Scripture testimony*” of his “*Episcopal brethren*, is *in no instance*, DIRECT AND EXPLICIT, *but all indirect and remotely inferential*.—They do not pretend to quote a single passage of Scripture which declares in so many words, or any thing like it, in favor of their claim, but their whole reliance, in regard to Scriptural testimony, is placed on *facts and deductions from those facts*.”!

I purpose to be very brief, yet as many persons among us

much as Scripture has been made the basis of the controversy; and they will allow that they could not have trusted their cause with a more able and accomplished advocate than the Rev. Mr. Barnes. *Episcopalians are so well satisfied with the result, that they have published the controversy for gratuitous circulation throughout the land. Will Presbyterians do the same? or, if not, will they accept the tract for gratuitous distribution? ”*

have been led to form very strange notions of the views of Episcopalians on this subject, I think it necessary, first to state the specific character of the three orders in the ministry, as they are regarded in the Episcopal Church.—The *first*, or superior order, were entrusted with the general oversight of the church, and with the power of ordaining, or admitting others to the ministry. The *second* order derived their authority through the imposition of the hands of the apostles, conjointly with that of the presbytery, and were authorized to preach the gospel, and administer the ordinances. The *third* were general assistants in the service of the church, occasionally preaching, and baptising, and were charged, also, with the care of the sick and helpless. These three orders are distinguished in Scripture, not only, by *the nature of their duties*, but also by their *peculiar names*. The first order is there called *apostles*, the second by the names of *bishops and elders*,—the third by that of *deacons*. Some time after the death of the original twelve apostles, the name of *bishop*, which simply means *overseer*, was given to those who succeeded to the place and authority of the apostles, as overseers of the whole; and the second order has, from that time, been called by the names of *elders* or *presbyters*. This circumstance should be remembered, because those who are more apt to be guided by *names* than things, have inferred, with Dr. Miller, that because the same name is now given to the first order, which all allow was originally given to the second, therefore there was no such order as the first. The three orders are now called by nearly the whole Christian world, bishops, priests or presbyters, and deacons. Nineteen-twentieths of the whole Christian world are Episcopalians.

1. *There was an order of ministers governing the church, and ordaining others to the ministry.* It is plain that the apostles, while they lived, were such an order; and, Dr. Miller's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding, there is much evidence in the Scriptures that they associated others with them

in the same station and work. He says, indeed, that, "it is manifest that ordination was not confined to the apostles, officially and technically so called; for nothing can be plainer than that Barnabas, Timothy, and Titus, who were not apostles in the appropriated sense, were invested with the ordaining power, and actually and abundantly exercised it. It is equally manifest that when the apostles ceased from the Church, they left no successors in that pre-eminent and peculiar office, which they filled during their lives." Now all these points *may be* equally manifest to Dr. Miller, but he brings no evidence *from Scripture* to make them manifest to others, nor, indeed, can he. *What are the marks of an apostle*, in his estimation? *What does he mean by an appropriated sense* to this term? *What constituted their office so pre-eminent and peculiar* that they could have no successors? *To whom does he limit the apostleship?* "The Apostles," says Bp. Onderdonk, "were not thus distinguished because they were appointed *by Christ personally*; for some are named 'Apostles' in Scripture, who were not thus appointed, as Matthias, Barnabas, and probably James the brother of the Lord,* all ordained by merely human ordainers; Silvanus also and Timothy are called 'Apostles;† and, besides Andronicus and Junia, others could be added to the list.‡ Nor were the apos-

* Acts i. 26; xiv. 4, 14. Gal. i. 19. Compare the latter with Mark vi. 3, and John vii. 5; and see HAMMOND on St James' epistle, and Bishop WHITE on the Catechism. p. 431.

† See 1. Thess. ii. 6, compared with i. 1. Paul, Silvanus, (or Silas,) and Timothy, are all included as "Apostles." In verse 18, Paul speaks of himself individually, not probably before. It is not unusual, indeed, for St. Paul to use the plural number of himself only; but the words "*Apostles*," and "*our own souls*" (verse 8.) being inapplicable to the singular use of the plural number, show that the three whose names are at the head of this epistle, are here spoken of jointly. And thus, Silas and Timothy are, with Paul, recognized, in this passage of Scripture, as "*apostles*."

‡ It will here be sufficient to remark, that in 2 Cor. xi. 13, and Rev. ii.

bles thus distinguished because they *had seen our Lord* after his resurrection; for “five hundred brethren” saw him.* And, though the twelve apostles were selected as special *witnesses of the resurrection*, yet others received that appellation who were not thus selected, as Timothy, Silvanus, Andronicus, Junia, etc. Nor were the apostles thus distinguished because of their power of *working miracles*; for Stephen and Philip, who were both deacons, are known to have had this power.† It follows, therefore, or will not at least be questioned, that the apostles were distinguished from the elders because they were *superior* to them in ministerial power and rights.”

The nature of the office which the apostles—comprising within this term all those who are named above—exercised, may be learnt from the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and the epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus. In the epistle to Titus, Paul, in solemnly charging Titus how to behave himself in the church of God, tells him “for this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city;” (i. 5.) *i. e.* to act as governor and ordainer of the church in Crete. This plainly sets forth the character and duties of the office. They were to ordain ministers, and govern in the church. This was their pre-eminent and peculiar office. In no part of the Scripture are such duties assigned to either elders or deacons. In the only place which will at all admit of such a construction, where Paul speaks of Timothy being ordained “by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery,” it is plain, that, as in another place he speaks of *himself* as the ordainer of Tim-

2, “false Apostles” are spoken of. These could not have been, or have pretended to be, any of the eleven, or of the five next above mentioned, or Paul. Their assuming therefore the title of ‘Apostles’ shows that there were enough *others* who had this title to make their pretended claim to it plausible. And those *others* must have been ordained, not by CHRIST, but by *men* who had his commission.—CALVIN allows Andronicus and Junia (Rom. xvi. 7.) to have been Apostles. *Instit.* b. IV. c. iii. sect. 5.

* 1. Cor. xv. 6.

† Acts vi. 8; viii. 6.

othy, he can only mean a concurrent act on their part. (2d Tim. i. 6.—1 Tim. iv. 14.) Surely then, Episcopalians *have some Scriptural ground* for believing that the apostles did have ecclesiastical successors.

2. There was also an order of ministers who did not exercise government over others, or ordain; but who exercised, in common with the apostolic order, the general duties of the ministry, *viz:* preaching the gospel, and administering the sacraments; and who, as occasion required, were placed in charge of particular congregations. Of this class, it would seem, were “the other seventy,” sent forth by our Lord, distinctly from “the twelve”—the *elders* ordained by the apostles—those ordained by Titus, agreeably to the instructions given him by St. Paul—those *bishops*, or *overseers of the flock*, who were sent for by Paul from Ephesus to Miletus—those addressed by Peter, in his first epistle—those who were ordained by Timothy according to the directions given him in the first epistle of Paul to him—those whom Paul associated with all the saints, and the deacons at Philippi, in his epistle to the church in that city; and those alluded to in the Acts of the Apostles, in the expressions, “Apostles and *Elders*”—“Apostles and *Elders*, and brethren.”—The apostles were commissioned by our Lord to gather, and establish his church, yet no one pretends that such a commission was given to *the seventy*; and it is apparent by the manner in which the election of Matthias, (who, in all probability was one of them, for he “had companied with” the apostles “all the time the Lord Jesus went in and out among them,”) into the place of Judas was conducted, that they were not considered as belonging to the same class with the apostles; else, why was an election, with such solemn forms required? The epistles to Timothy and Titus, moreover show, that they were vested with *authority over the elders*, (or bishops) or, as we now call them presbyters, of the churches in Ephesus and Crete. They were empowered to check errors in doctrine—to *rebuke* the disobe-

dient *elders*—to give honor to those who should deserve it and were not to admit any *suddenly* to the ministry. Of course, the elders were inferior to them in office and authority. There is a very plain distinction between these two classes of men.

3. There was also a third order in the ministry, who were called *deacons*. That there was such an order in the church at Jerusalem—that they were chosen by the disciples generally, and were set apart for their office by the imposition of the hands of the *apostles*, with solemn prayer, is plain. It does not appear, as some think, that the deacons were limited to the duties which originally caused their separation—taking care of the offerings at the altar for the benefit of the poor,—on the contrary, it is certain, that Stephen, who was one of the first seven deacons, was an open and zealous preacher of the gospel, and of Philip we are not only told that he was a preacher, but that he *baptized* the Ethiopian eunuch, and also men and women in Samaria. The apostles however approved of Philip's ministry, for they sent Peter and John to *confirm* those whom he had baptized; and the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them, was a still higher confirmation of his ministry. He is elsewhere called an *Evangelist*; a term probably of nearly the same meaning with missionary. Paul in his epistles to Timothy, speaks twice of the office of a deacon as of one of permanent necessity in the christian church.

This is only a brief summary of what might be said upon this subject. Enough, however, it is believed has been alleged to show what credence should be given to Dr. Miller's assertion that the New Testament does not afford the least countenance to the claims of Episcopalians.

Dr. Miller quotes a passage from Dr. *Isaac Barrow*, for the purpose of showing, that Dr. Barrow did not consider the apostles as having any regular successors. He supposes that this opinion is to have great weight against Episcopacy, because Dr. B. was, as he calls him, a *prelatist*. I am so un-

fortunate as not to perceive any result of this kind, though I must certainly admit Dr. B. to have been a man of great ability, and learning, and of good judgment on many points. Dr. Miller has been not a little distinguished for citing writers in this way to sustain his opinions against the Episcopal church, and sometimes with the most unfortunate results to himself, and his cause.* Your assault upon your "Episcopal brethren," may have the full benefit of all testimony of this nature. It may be turned against your own cause with powerful force, and to a remarkable extent, as I have the means to show. To make no reference at present, to writers of past ages, of your own denomination, what opinion should I be led to entertain of the present state of the Presbyterian church, in this country, by a resort to testimony of this character. With a class of divines on one side claiming the exclusive validity of presbyterian ordination—the *jure divino* of presbytery, and insisting upon unscrupulous submission to every line of the Confession of Faith†—and another class

* Dr. M. seems to have intended that his readers should infer that Dr. Barrow did not himself believe in the apostolic origin of Episcopacy. Let the following quotations from the same work bear witness with what justice such an opinion can be formed. "Of the distinction between bishops and the inferior clergy, there was never in ancient times made any question, nor did it seem disputable in the church, except to one malcontent, Aerius:—it standeth upon very firm and clear grounds, upon the reason of the case, upon the testimony of Holy Scripture, upon general tradition, and unquestionable monuments of antiquity, upon the common judgment and practice of the greatest saints, persons most renowned for wisdom and piety in the church.—The Holy Scripture doth plainly enough countenance this distinction; for therein we have represented one angel presiding over several presbyters; therein we find episcopal ordination and jurisdiction exercised; we have one bishop constituting presbyters in divers cities of his diocese." etc.

† The following extracts will explain this statement. Dr. M'Leod of New York, in his *Ecclesiastical Catechism*, p. 29, says, "A person who is not ordained to office by a *presbytery*, has no right to be received as a minister of Christ: His administration of ordinances is invalid: No

pouring derision, without qualification or compassion, upon all such pretensions, and declaring the whole system to be waxing old, and ready to perish,* and yet another class—but I forbear. I have no wish to meddle with the unhappy differences, which are well known to exist to a very serious extent in the Church of which *Dr. Miller*, and the *editors of the American Presbyterian* are members, but only to intimate the necessity of caution, in the use of such authorities, as *Dr. M.* has here called to his aid.

He has however, chosen to rely on *Dr. Barrow's* “*judgment*” in this matter, while he objects to the “*judgment*” of *Theodoret*, a Christian Father who lived in the 5th century, and whose testimony is directly opposed to that of *Dr. B.*! *Theodoret*, according to *Dr. Miller's* quotation, says, “The same persons were anciently called bishops and presbyters; and those whom we now call bishops, were then called apostles. But in process of time, the title of apostle was appropriated to those, who were called apostles in the strict sense, and the rest, who had, formerly, the name of apostles,

divine blessing is promised upon his labors: It is rebellion against the Head of the church to support him in his pretensions: Christ has excluded him in his Providence from admission through the ordinary door; and if he has no evidence of miraculous powers to testify his extraordinary mission, he is an impostor.” *Dr. Green* of Philadelphia, in the *Christian Advocate* for March, 1828, says, “An entire parity and equality of rank and office, among those who are permanently to preach the gospel, and dispense all its ordinances, [in other words, *presbyterianism*] is a *divine appointment*; and, in reference to the gospel ministry, the ONLY *divine appointment*, which is apparent in the sacred record.” And even *Dr. Miller* himself, in the first edition of his *Letters on the Ministry*, p. 347, says, “It is only so far as any succession flows through the line of *presbyters*, that it is either regular or valid.” It would be exceedingly difficult to say, where higher toned or more exclusive opinions on this subject are to be found.—See also *Dr. Duncan's* account of the causes of his expulsion from the Presbyterian church.

*See the *Evangelist* and other current religious papers of the Presbyterian church.

were styled bishops." Now, it must be admitted, that Episcopalians do, frequently, quote this testimony of Theodoret; but it is for the obvious reason, that it is the plain, honest, straight forward statement of a man, who appears to have had no personal object to serve; and who is speaking, incidentally, of a *fact*, considered as established and well known in his day. And why should his testimony not be received? Dr. M. says, "It is not the testimony of Scripture."—No, indeed, nor does it profess to be. It is only to a fact which occurred *after* the books of Scripture were written. The men whom he refers to, are called, and designated in the Scripture, as *apostles*; and for that fact we have,—as above shown,—Scripture testimony. But Dr. M. says, "It is the dream of a writer *four centuries* after the apostolic age, in whose time the Church had become very corrupt, etc." Well, suppose it should be said in reply, that the "*judgment*" of Dr. Barrow, on this subject, is the dream of a writer more than *a thousand years later still*; and at a period, when Dr. M. must allow there was much corruption in the Christian churches in many parts of the earth. Surely, Theodoret's testimony to a historical fact four hundred years after it occurred, is quite as much to be relied on, as that of Dr. Barrow, who lived sixteen hundred years after it occurred, and who could have had no better testimony to it than we have!*

A second reason assigned by Dr. Miller, why Theodoret's testimony, in this matter, is not to be received, is that, "*no one* doubts that in Theodoret's time, prelacy,"—by which he means, Episcopacy—"had obtained a complete establishment." Indeed! Episcopalians believe that it was not only established then, but even in the apostles' days. One would suppose that impartial men would consider this fact a strong confirma-

* In relation to the fact to which Theodoret testifies, that bishops were originally termed *apostles*, having succeeded to that office, Dr. Miller knows that Episcopalians are also in the habit of quoting *Hilary* who lived about 376, and who testifies to the same fact.

tion of his testimony instead of invalidating it. It is a direct admission that Theodoret's testimony was consistent with the universal belief of the Christian church in his day.

If Dr. Miller fails of convincing his readers, it will not be for want of bold assertions—bold, beyond those of any other polemic with whom I am acquainted—bold beyond any warrant of testimony, or the previously declared opinions of any other assailant of Episcopacy. He says, “It is very certain that the Fathers who flourished nearest the apostolic age, generally represent presbyters and not prelates (bishops) as the successors of apostles,” and he actually has the rashness to quote *Ignatius*,—that identical *father*, whose writings are genuine, or not genuine—worthy, or not worthy of confidence, according as he may be made to serve the purpose to which Dr. Miller chooses to apply him! How little he is able to make use of him in assailing Episcopacy, let the following exhibition of the manner in which his quotations are made, and of Ignatius' own statements show.

Dr. Miller quotes him as saying

The presbyters *succeed* in the place of the bench of the apostles.

The passage truly copied is

I exhort you, that ye study to do all things in a divine concord: your bishops in the place of God; your presbyters in the place of the council of the apostles; and your deacons most dear to me being entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ.—*Ep. to Magnesians.*

AGAIN.

In like manner let all reverence the presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God, and college of the apostles.

In like manner let all reverence the deacons as Jesus Christ; and the bishop as the Father, and the presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God, and college of the apostles; without these there is no Church.—*Ep. to Trallians.*

AGAIN.

Be subject to your presbyters as to the apostles of Jesus Christ our hope.

It is therefore necessary, that as ye do, so without your bishop you should do nothing: also be ye subject to your presbyters, as the apostles of Jesus Christ our hope, in whom if we walk, we shall be found in him. The deacons, also, as being ministers of Jesus Christ, &c.—*Ep. to Trallians.*

AGAIN.

Follow the presbyters as the apostles.

See that ye all follow your bishop as Jesus Christ the Father; and the presbyters as the apostles.—*Ep. to Smyrneans.*

The feeblest capacity can judge of the integrity of these quotations of Dr. Miller. Let it be remembered that his object is to show reasons for *rejecting episcopacy*; or, as he calls it, *prelacy*—*rejecting* the belief that *three* orders, (bishops, priests, and deacons,) were established in the Christian ministry by the apostles. Was there ever a more unfaithful application of any man's written opinions? Dr. M. omits the *facts* to which Ignatius actually does testify, and changes a high wrought, fanciful, and unreasonable *comparison*, which the unbridled zeal of Ignatius led him to make, into an allegation of *facts*; of *such* facts too, as stand *diametrically opposed* to Ignatius' own testimony! What too, shall we think of Dr. M., when we find him making *Ignatius* speak a language directly opposite to *Dr. Barrow*, whom he had quoted above; and yet seeking to make them both weigh against Episcopacy!

He makes *Ignatius* say

The presbyters *succeed* in the place of the apostles.

But he quotes *Dr. Barrow* as saying

The apostolical office, as such, was personal and temporary; and therefore, accord-

ing to its nature and design, *not successive*, not communicable to others, in perpetual descentance from them.

Dr. Miller makes no quotation from *Irenæus*, but contents himself with saying, in his usual bold manner, that "*it is notorious that Irenæus repeatedly speaks of presbyters as being the successors of the apostles.*" But in order to make out this assertion, he must quote from *Irenæus* after the same manner which he has used with *Ignatius*, that is, unfairly and untruly. It is enough to say, in reply, that *Irenæus* bears strong testimony to *Episcopacy*, for writers on your own side, who deny the *apostolic* origin of *episcopacy*, generally and freely admit, that *Episcopacy* was in his time fully established; and as Dr. Miller thinks that this circumstance must have influenced the testimony of *Theodoret*, you cannot but allow it to have in this case, the weight which you both claim for it in the other. *Irenæus*, then, by your own rules is to be set down as an unquestioned witness on the side of *Episcopacy*. Even Dr. M. is compelled to admit, that *Irenæus* "represents bishops as the successors of the apostles," though he would make us believe, if we rest upon his assertion, that these bishops were presbyters.*

*"Between *Irenæus* and *St. John*," says the learned Mr. Faber, "there exists only the single link of *Polycarp*. *Irenæus* was the scholar of *Polycarp*; and *Polycarp* was the disciple of *St. John*."

"Hence, I apprehend, *Irenæus* may be viewed as an unexceptionable witness, not only of facts which occurred in his own immediate time, but also of any inseparably connected facts (if such there be) which are alleged to have taken place in the time of the apostles."

"Now the *fact*, which *Irenæus* mentions as existing in his own time, is the *universal establishment of the episcopate*."

"Respecting this *naked fact*, I perceive not how he could have been mistaken. We all know without a possibility of error, that *episcopacy* is at this present moment established in *England*. The fact presents itself to our very eyes: and we are sure that we cannot be deceived. In a similar manner, *Irenæus* could not but have known with absolute certainty,

Even supposing Dr. Miller's quotations from Augustine to be true,—which, from what has been shown above, may reasonably be doubted, and I have not at present the means, if it were

what form of ecclesiastical polity universally prevailed at the time when he himself flourished. This form, vouching for a mere cognizable *fact*, he declares to have been the episcopal.”

“On the authority, then, of Irenæus, we may be quite certain respecting the *naked fact*, that in his days the episcopate was universally established: and for this early *fact* (for the personal testimony of Irenæus runs back to within forty years of the death of St. John) we are naturally led to ask, whence that universally-established polity could have originated?”

“The question is fully answered by the same Irenæus after a manner, which, I think, evinces the moral impossibility of error.”

“He assures us, that in every church there had been a regular succession of bishops from the time of the apostles: and he himself, as we have observed, was separated from St. John only by the single intervening link of Polycarp. To enumerate the successions of the churches, he remarks, would occupy too much space and time: he confines himself, therefore, as a single specimen of the whole, to the succession of the Roman church. On this topic he is very precise and particular.”

“The Roman church itself, he tells us, was founded by the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul. These inspired ministers of God, having thus jointly founded that church, jointly delivered the episcopate of it to its first bishop Linus, who is mentioned by Paul in his second Epistle to Timothy.* Linus was succeeded by Anacletus: and, after him, in the third degree from the apostles, Clement received the episcopate; which Clement, as Irenæus observes, saw, and heard, and conferred with the apostles themselves.† Clement was followed by Euaristus; Euaristus, by Alexander; Alexander, by Sixtus; Sixtus by Telesphorus; Telesphorus, by Hyginus; Hyginus, by Pius; Pius, by Anicetus; Anicetus, by Soter; and Soter, by Eleutherius: who thus, as Irenæus remarks, held, at the precise time when he was writing the sentence, the Roman Episcopate in the twelfth degree from the apostles.”

“To this succession he incidently subjoins the origination of the episcopate in the church of Smyrna.”

“At Rome, as we have seen, he vouches for the *fact*, that the episcopate of that city emanated from the two apostles Peter and Paul: at Smyrna, he vouches for the *fact*, that the episcopate of that city emanated

*2. Tim iv. 21.

†See Philip. iv. 3.

worth the trouble, to verify it,—Episcopalians would have no difficulty in assenting to it. I presume no one of them doubts, that, in the peculiar circumstances of the apostles, as *inspired* men, gifted with plenary power to regulate the Church, their office was above that of any bishop. It is only *the permanent and necessary* duties of their office, which Episcopalians believe to have descended to bishops. We agree with Dr. M. as to what those duties are. The question between us is, whether they were succeeded in those duties by bishops, or by presbyters.

Neither Dr. Miller, nor the editors of the American Presbyterian, seem to be aware of the real character of the assertion which they make, that “any other view of this subject” than they have chosen to give, “*is an imposition on popular credulity.*” Nothing is easier than to substitute railing for argument; and suitable epithets, and phrases, are always ready in uncharitable minds. Dr. Miller, in all his controver-

ated from the apostle John. He himself, was the scholar of Polycarp, and Polycarp had not only been specially the disciple of John, but in his early youth he had received instructions also from the other apostles.—By the apostle John, Polycarp was appointed bishop of Smyrna: and he presided in that see for the space of half a century, until he closed his career by martyrdom. Whatever he had learned from the apostles, this venerable man, according to Irenæus, delivered to the church: and the same testimony was borne, by all the churches of Asia, and by those who had succeeded Polycarp, down to the time when Irenæus himself was engaged in writing his work against heresies.”*

“Thus we find, that the closely connected *fact*, for which Irenæus vouches in addition to the *fact*, which he beheld with his own personal eyes, is the appointment of the first bishops by the apostles themselves: nor, when we consider the circumstances under which he was placed, himself a bishop, the successor of the holy nonagenarian Pothinus, himself the disciple of the martyr Polycarp, himself in point of actual knowledge reaching within forty years of the death of St. John, is it easy to conceive, how he could have been mistaken in the specification of a *fact* which must at that time have been a matter of public and universal notoriety.”—*Faber’s Difficulties of Romanism.*

* Iren. adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 3.

sies, and they have not been few, nor far between, has been not a little distinguished in this way. If his feelings towards the Episcopal church are such that he must vent them in this mode, those who voluntarily republish and circulate his uncharitable denunciations, must be content to share with him, the odium. Enough has been said to show, how far Dr. Miller has a right to charge Episcopalians with imposing on popular credulity.

It is not a little singular, that, while Dr. Miller's opinions in regard to the competency of the early Christian writers, commonly called *the Fathers*, have varied so much; and while you, Messrs Editors, also allow him to speak of them so slightly, *as witnesses of facts* in the early history of the Church, you should *in the very next column* of your paper of May 21st, quote many of these same Fathers, as competent, nay, unquestioned witnesses in behalf of Infant baptism! It is a striking example of the manner in which men's views will prejudice them in regard to matters of fact. Many respectable writers in favor of Episcopacy, have expressed a willingness to let Episcopacy abide by the testimony commonly adduced in favor of Infant baptism, and the Christian Sabbath, and the authenticity of the books of Scripture. The same process of reasoning, which is used to sustain these points, will also amply sustain Episcopacy. As an exemplification of this, let Dr. Woods' able work on Infant Baptism be taken. If *Episcopacy*, and the necessary corresponding words, be substituted, in his first chapter for *Infant baptism*, and its corresponding terms, I believe Episcopalians generally would be quite content with it, as a statement of their views, and of the testimony for sustaining them.

A large proportion of your extracts from Dr. Miller, consist of *simple, and wholly unsupported, assertions*; the least laborious mode in the world for accomplishing his object among the credulous, and that enormous class of people, who,

content to take any thing and every thing upon trust, may be described in the significant words, *deceiving and being deceived!* There is an exemplification of this remark, in the assertion of Dr. M. that the whole argument for the superiority of bishops as successors of the apostles, "has been wholly abandoned by a number of the most distinguished divines of the church of England." Dr. M. well knows that he cannot sustain this assertion by adequate proof; but it was easily made—could not be refuted, but by an examination of the writings of all the divines of that church, who have written on the subject; a labor which no one would undertake—and yet, it would certainly be believed by *some*, for no falsehood is so gross that none can be found to swallow it. These *most distinguished* divines, if he really had in view any *divines* whatever, will be found to derive all their distinction, most probably, from his notice of them. "That was excellently observed, say I, when I read a passage in an author, whose opinion agrees with mine; when we differ, then I pronounce him mistaken. And this," as was said in another case, "is undoubtedly the philosophy of the matter."

We now come to a very remarkable change in Dr. Miller's course of argument. *Before*, Dr. M. could say, "when we ask the advocates of Episcopacy whence they derive their favorite doctrine that diocesan bishops succeeded the apostles, *they refer us to no passage of Scripture* asserting or even hinting it." *Now*, however, he seriously sets about replying to "*arguments from Scripture commonly urged by our Episcopal brethren!*" What is to be thought of the candor or prudence of such an opponent? Were he sure of the justice of his cause—had he no suspicion of the defects of his own argument,—would he resort to such means, and lay himself open to such imputations as are here implied? Dr. M. well knows that his arguments, even as stated by himself, have *all* been answered many a time. But assertions may be repeated, blindly repeated, where arguments cannot be adduced; and he seems

to care but little what cross purposes even his own assertions may be made to play!

Dr. M. states that Episcopalians commonly urge "that Timothy was evidently, in fact, Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus of Crete; and that this furnishes a plain example of an order of ministers superior to common pastors." Although he chooses to assert that "there is not a shadow of proof of this in the New Testament," yet I venture to declare that it is as well attested as any similar fact in history! How indeed, can any one who reads the epistles to Timothy and Titus, doubt it? Is it not evident that both these men were left with delegated apostolic power, in the respective districts assigned them? Were they not to govern the church, and admit men to the ministry, taking care that improper persons did not impose on them? What need of admitting others to the ministry, if they themselves were only with a pastoral and not a diocesan charge—supposing, as this argument does, that the charge of a single church only was confided to them? Or why were they to have power to rebuke,—one of the last and highest acts of government—to rebuke an *elder*, when not more than one or two elders could, necessarily, be connected with them; and even then must be equal or colleagued with them? To *rule*, *rebuke*, and *ordain*, were undeniably acts of authority,—can any instance be pointed out, in Scripture, where such authority was given to any of those *termed elders*? Did St. Paul charge those, whom he called from Ephesus to Miletus, with authority to these acts, as he did, solemnly and urgently, Timothy and Titus? Now, it is of little consequence, whatever Dr. M. finds it convenient to think about it, whether either of these men had a *fixed* diocesan charge at Ephesus and Crete, or not? Episcopalians generally do not claim that they had. Neither is it of any consequence to this question, whether they "ever performed the work of ordination *alone* or not." Modern bishops do not ordain presbyters, without the concurrence of the priesthood,

or presbytery. The question is, simply, a question of *fact*. Were Timothy and Titus vested with power to perform any acts which imply *authority*, and which power was not, so far as we have evidence, conferred upon others, who were, nevertheless, ministers of the word and sacraments? Candid minds need have no difficulty in answering this question in the affirmative.* When Dr. M. says that "there is no hint in the

* "There were in the Church at Ephesus three orders of ministers; Timothy, the Presbyters, who are also called Bishops or Overseers, and the Deacons. That Timothy was the ordaining officer in that church is beyond all contradiction. There is not a hint in the directions given to him on that point, to associate Presbyters with himself; but, on the contrary, it is evident that he was to be *supreme* and single in the discharge of this duty. It certainly is a very extraordinary thing, that when there was a number of Presbyters at Ephesus, St. Paul should put such a mark of reprobation upon presbyterian government, as to send an officer to ordain and govern that church, when those Presbyters were fully competent to the business. And what was their conduct on that occasion? Did they remonstrate against it? Did they oppose Timothy in the execution of his office? Not a hint of that in scripture, nor in all antiquity. What sort of men must those Presbyters have been? Certainly either fools who knew not their rights; or men who had such a superabundance of the "milk of human kindness," that they could not bear the least contention, even in the sacred cause of truth and justice."

"If it be necessary to set this matter in a clearer point of light, perhaps the following observations will do it. St. Paul sent from Miletus to Ephesus, and called the *elders of the church*. When they arrived the Apostle gave them this solemn charge—*Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.*—Here is not the least intimation to these Presbyters, that their commission implied the power of ordaining. There is no mention of the qualifications requisite for the persons that were to be ordained—nothing, but to take care of their own conduct, and to feed with the word of life those over whom they were placed. But he gives very particular directions to Timothy concerning the persons whom he should ordain, both Presbyters and Deacons. Is it not wonderful, that St. Paul, when he was about to take his leave for ever of those Presbyters, did not say one

New Testament that Timothy and Titus performed any act, to which any regular minister of the gospel is not fully competent," he is plainly regardless of obvious facts.

word to them about so important a part of their duty as ordaining, if they possessed that power? Again—St. Paul charges Timothy, *not to receive an accusation against an Elder but before two or three witnesses*; but he gives no such charge to the Elders or Overseers of Ephesus. He also says to Timothy, *them* (meaning the Elders) *that sin, rebuke before all, that others also may fear*. Nothing can be more absurd than to suppose, that those Presbyters who were subject to the censures of Timothy, were possessed of equal powers with him. Had they refused to submit to the just censures of their governor, which, upon presbyterian principles, they ought to have done, I doubt very much whether their title of Bishop would have been of service to them.

Further—St. Paul says to those Elders, that *some of themselves should arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them*. Now, one would suppose after mentioning this, that he would have told them how to proceed—would have directed them to receive an accusation against perverse Elders, and have charged them to rebuke such before all. But no such thing: they had no power of that sort committed to them. Besides, I cannot conceive how human ingenuity could have devised any thing more effectual, to make the Elders speak perverse things (if the word *perverse* could with propriety be used,) than to send Timothy to take out of their hands the power of ordaining, and of governing the Church at Ephesus.

Once more—St. Paul gives a very solemn charge to Timothy, *I give thee charge in the sight of God who quickeneth all things, and before Jesus Christ, who before Pontius Pilate, witnessed a good confession, that thou keep this commandment, without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

The Apostle had no expectation that Timothy would live till the day of judgment. This charge, therefore, was not confined to the person of Timothy, but extended to his office to the end of time. It was of the nature of that promise which Christ made to his Apostles, that he *would be with them to the end of the world*. But the charge given by the Apostle to the Elders of Ephesus was merely personal—it related to nothing beyond their own lives. As they had no power to constitute others in their room, so there is no charge given to them to keep what was com-

It is true that Dr. Miller quotes "the eminent Episcopal divine, Dr. Whitby," as saying, "the great controversy concerning this (epistle) and the epistles to Timothy is, whether Timothy and Titus were indeed made bishops, the one of Ephesus and the proconsular Asia; the other of Crete. Now of this matter, I confess, I can find nothing in any writer of the first three centuries, nor any intimation that they bore that name." This Dr. M. and the *American Presbyterian* put in italics, as indicating their great estimation of the impor-

mitted to them to the coming of Christ, or to commit what they had received to faithful men.

It is now I think as clear as the great luminary of the day, when not a cloud obscures his disc, that the Church of Ephesus, consisting of Presbyters, Deacons, and laity, were committed to the oversight, superintendance and government of Timothy; and that the title of Bishop given to the Presbyters of that church, as having a subordinate oversight of the laity under Timothy, in no respect or degree impaired his superiority. He was the Overseer of Overseers—the Bishop of Bishops. To the office which Timothy held, succeeded that order in the church to which, from the beginning of the second century, the title of Bishops has been appropriated, and not to the second order indifferently styled, in the apostolic times, Bishops or Elders. If our Bishops had succeeded to the second order, they could possess no more power than that order did.

That the office which Timothy held did not expire with him, is evident from its very nature; for there is the same need of an officer now in the Church who can ordain, as there was in the days of Timothy; and accordingly, we find from the testimony of antiquity, that he had his successors, and that at the time of the council of Chalcedon, twenty-seven Bishops had governed that church.

The Church of Crete will afford us another instance of Episcopal pre-eminence. But there is really no necessity of going over this ground. The instances of Timothy and Titus are so parallel, and rest so much upon similar authorities, that what has been said concerning the *former*, may generally be applied to the latter. To the testimony from the epistle itself may be added, the concurrent testimony of the primitive writers, who assert that Titus was the first Bishop, or Chief Ruler of the Church of Crete.—*Two Letters to the Editor of the Christians Magazine.*

tance of the admission. It is truly wonderful that Dr. M. did not see, or seeing, should have adduced this admission on his own side, that Dr. Whitby is here speaking, not of their office as bishops, nor of their power as such, but of their *local jurisdiction*, *i. e.* whether they were *fixed* bishops of the provinces of Ephesus and Crete. No candid man who will read Whitby's Commentary on the epistles to Timothy and Titus, will say, that he meant to sanction the slightest suspicion of the Episcopal character of Timothy and Titus; to sustain which he has collected a very large amount of testimony. As soon would he deny the light of the sun when he is blazing in the firmament. Even at the end of Dr. Miller's quotation, Dr. Whitby adds, what Dr. M. did not choose to copy, the words, "*but this defect is abundantly supplied by the concurrent suffrage of the fourth and fifth centuries.*" *

Dr. M. gives us "a regular syllogism" as containing the arguments of Episcopal writers on this subject; such as he might put into their mouths, if he could, for a moment, suppose, that they were incompetent as scholars or logicians to perceive the effect of their own reasoning. I shall have occasion, hereafter, to try, in a legitimate way, the force of Dr. M's. regular syllogism on some of his own arguments. In the mean time, Messrs. Editors, I offer you the following

* The following is Dr. Whitby's own synopsis of the testimony collected by him, and his argument founded on it.

"Timothy and Titus were not bishops fixed to a diocese, but yet they had episcopal jurisdiction over presbyters.

Hence it follows,—1. that this superiority cannot be contrary to the gospel rule,—2. that it is not repugnant to the constitution of churches in the apostle's times, for men to have jurisdiction over more than one particular congregation,—3. that the apostolical power of governing churches, might be committed to others whom they would entrust with it,—4. that they did commit this trust to others, is proved from Scripture, tradition, and reason."

which is quite as regular, and much more correct and applicable, as a substitute for his.—The power to ordain and govern elders necessarily implies superiority to them: Timothy and Titus had that power: Therefore, Timothy and Titus were superior to elders.

Dr. M. proceeds: “another argument from Scripture, commonly urged by our Episcopal brethren, is derived from the *angels*, addressed in the epistles to the seven churches of the lesser Asia.” In his usual presumptuous manner he adds that this argument is destitute of plausibility. He rightly says, however, that “the term angel signifies messenger. As an ecclesiastical title, it is derived from the old Testament. In every Jewish synagogue there was an angel of the church whose duty it was to preside and take the lead in public worship.” But Dr. M. has in his usual manner, omitted to add, as he should have done, that this *angel* was assisted by a body of presbyters or elders, over whom he presided. Although this fact sustains the Episcopal theory; and was, for that reason probably, omitted by Dr. M., yet he asserts, that, “if we suppose each of these angels to be the ordinary pastor of a single church or congregation, it will perfectly accord with every representation concerning them in the epistles in question.” But how will you, Messrs. Editors, reconcile the fact of there being but “a single pastor of a single congregation,” at this time, at *Ephesus*, when, years before, Paul had sent for the *elders* of that church, to Miletus? Had the church already become so reduced as to have but *one* pastor? Even this epistle bears witness, that there had been some among them who claimed to be *apostles*, which implies that there was a demand at *Ephesus* for more ministerial labor than *one* could supply; but take the case, presented above, that it had, as in the time of Timothy and Paul, a bishop and presbyters, and the comparison will hold with the angel, who presided, and the ministering elders. But, certainly, in each of these epistles *an individual* is addressed; and it must be very difficult in-

deed for those who look at the known circumstances of the churches in that region, at that time, to believe, with Dr. M., that there was but *one pastor* in each of the seven populous churches. Indeed Dr. M. himself says below, that "nothing is plainer than that there was *a plurality of bishops* in the same church." "What can be more plain," says good old Bishop Hall, "than that in every one of these churches, there were many presbyters, yet but one angel. If that one were not in place above the rest, and higher by the head than they, how comes he to be noted in the throng? Why was not the direction to all the angels of the church at Ephesus? All were angels in respect to their ministry; one was the angel in respect of his fixed superiority. There were thousands of stars in this firmament of the Asian churches; there were but seven of the first magnitude; who can endure such an evasion, that while *one* is mentioned, *many* are meant." "In support of the opinion that Episcopacy was established during the lifetime of the apostles, and with their approbation," says the learned historian Mosheim, "we are supplied with an argument of such strength, in those *angels* to whom St. John addressed the epistles, which by the command of our Saviour himself, he sent to the seven churches of Asia, as the presbyterians, as they are termed, let them labor and strive as they may, will never be able to overcome."—*Commentaries on the first three Centuries. Vidal's translation: p. 227.* So strong indeed is the testimony borne to Episcopacy by the case of the seven angels, that even Baxter was led by it to admit that "there were fixed bishops in the time of St. John."

Dr. Miller leads you, gentlemen, to make very light of the belief of Episcopalians that James was bishop of Jerusalem. Lightly, however, as he treats it, when to his own statement we add the testimony of Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian, and indeed of all antiquity, it is impossible for you to set it aside. Dr. M. does not attempt an argument on the subject.*

* How great must have been the irritation on Dr. M's. mind against

When Dr. Miller asserts that "the learned Jerome, in the fourth century, declares concerning prelacy, as having no foundation in divine appointment, and as gradually brought in *by* human ambition," he gives us a most strange perversion of Jerome's language. Jerome actually represents Episcopacy as brought in, not *by*, but as a *needed cure for* human ambition—to prevent strife among the presbytery; and in the very passage to which Dr. M. alludes, he refers the introduction of Episcopacy, to the time when jealousies began among the presbyters of Corinth in the absence of Paul. (I Cor. i. 12.)—His own language is, "Till through the instinct of the devil, there grew in the church, factions; and among the people it began to be professed, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas; churches were governed by the common advice of presbyters; but when every one began to reckon those whom he had baptized as his own, and not Christ's, it was decreed in *the whole world*, that one, chosen out of the presbyters, should be placed over the rest, to whom all care of the church should belong, and so the seeds of schism be removed." What a misrepresentation of this language is Dr. M's. statement! Besides, how, if Jerome were on his side, could he quote him, when he is liable to the same objection which he brings against Theodoret, of living three or four centuries after the apostles? Will Dr. Miller never be consistent with himself? Jerome says, elsewhere, "all bishops are the successors of the apostles:"—he says, that "others were *ordained apostles* by those [apostles] whom our Lord had chosen"—that there were bishops in Alexandria from the time of St. Mark—that St. James was the first bishop of Jerusalem—that Timothy and Titus were

his "Episcopal brethren," when he could say, as he does at this point, of the sources of proof which they allege from Scripture, that, "*they are just as destitute of force, and just as delusive, as the popish doctrine that the primacy of St. Peter, and the transmission of that primacy to the bishops of Rome, may be proved from the word of God.*"!

bishops of Ephesus and Crete—that Ignatius was bishop of Antioch, etc. etc. But Dr. M. says, that the sense in which he represents Jerome’s opinion, is the same in which it was understood by the famous English bishops, Jewel, Whitgift, Stillingfleet, and others. He does not tell us, however, *where*, in their writings, the *proofs* that they so understood Jerome are to be found. There is no hazard in saying, that he could not so refer to them, as the following actual quotations will serve to show. Bp. *Jewel* says in his preface to his *Apology for the Church of England* that “Episcopacy was settled in all the churches *in the very days of the apostles and by them;*” and in the same work, chap. xiii. sect. 10., he actually quotes *Jerome* as saying, that “all bishops are the successors of the apostles.” Abp. *Whitgift*, in a letter to Beza, (1553) says “the Bishops were successors of the apostles, especially in certain points of their function.” Bp. *Stillingfleet* in his *Unreasonableness of Separation*, says, “the bishops succeeded the apostles in the government of the churches:”—“There is as much reason to believe the apostolical succession to be of divine institution, as the canon of Scripture, or the observation of the Lord’s day”—again, “the case of Timothy is an uncontrollable instance of diocesan Episcopacy.” Quotations of this tenor, directly opposed to Dr. Miller’s assertion, might be largely increased. How little could Dr. M. know of those men, and their writings, when he alleged, that they understood Jerome as saying, that Episcopacy was brought in by human invention, and had no foundation in divine appointment!

And now *Ignatius* again crosses our path. Dr. M. has now discovered that this writer, concerning whom his opinions have been as various, as the shades of the forest leaves in autumn—this writer, “who is commonly regarded and resorted to as the sheet anchor of the Episcopal claim,” is no longer to be considered as such; for, the opinions of all learned men, and common sense, to the contrary notwithstanding, Dr. Miller gravely says that he does “not wish, a

more distinct and graphic description of presbyterianism than the epistles of Ignatius represent as existing in all the churches which he addressed"! Let us see how this strange argument will apply. Dr. M. says "Ignatius speaks expressly of a bishop, elders, and deacons, existing in every worshiping assembly—Presbyterians are the only denomination who have in every worshiping assembly, a bishop, presbyters, or elders, and deacons." But by turning back to page 20 it will be seen that Dr. M. contends earnestly, and absurdly misquotes Ignatius to show, that *bishops are not*, and *presbyters alone are*, the true successors of the apostles: "the presbyters succeed in the place of the bench of the apostles." If, however, Ignatius is a witness not for Episcopacy, but Presbyterianism, then the presbyters he refers to, are the present *ruling elders* of the Presbyterian church. You will not, Messrs. Editors, assert, that your *ruling elders* exercise now, or at any previous time have exercised, *all* the duties of the ministry,—that *they* have in *these* duties succeeded the apostles. Yet Dr. M. says, in the former part of this fourth chapter, that "as ministers of Christ, empowered to go forth preaching the gospel and administering Christian sacraments, they had successors, and these successors were, manifestly, *all those who were empowered to preach the gospel, and administer the sacramental seals*: for, in the final commission which the Saviour gave to the apostles,—they are sent forth to disciple all nations, and to baptise them, etc." Ruling elders, I believe, do none of these things, and therefore, by Dr. Miller's own testimony, are *not* successors to the apostles. If it be said, that Dr. M. means that these elders "succeed to the bench of the apostles" as *ruling* only; it may be answered again, in Dr. M's. own words, that "the least hint cannot be produced from the New Testament, that the powers possessed by the apostles were afterwards *divided*." If, moreover, the ruling elders of the Presbyterian church, are to be regarded as the successors of the apostles, with their *limited* duties; and if the apostles had

no successors superior to them, (as is the obvious inference, in Dr. M's. application of the testimony of Ignatius to presbyterianism,) to whom it may be asked, do the *pastors* of that church succeed? If it be answered, to the *bishops* of Ignatius, I again inquire, but of whom are the bishops of Ignatius successors? Not of the apostles, upon Dr. M's. own showing, for they are succeeded by the *elders*. Into what a dilemma has he thus brought you, Messrs Editors! Your *elders* succeed the apostles, but your *pastors*, who, upon this principle, have no prototype, and are plainly without divine institution, *preside over the successors of the apostolic bench!* But what does your *Form of Church Government* say on this subject? Its 5th chapter is in these words: "Ruling elders are properly *the representatives of the people*, chosen by them, for the purpose of exercising *government and discipline*, in conjunction with pastors or ministers. This office has been understood by a great part of the Protestant Reformed churches, to be designated in the Holy Scriptures, by the title of *governments*, and of those who rule well but do not labor in the word and doctrine."—Neither, in declaring the nature of the office of *pastor*, does the *Form of Government*, make any reference to apostolic succession for its ministers. Dr. M. is not therefore sustained by the constitution of his own church, in his attempt to show, that presbyters, whether pastors, or ruling elders, were successors of the apostles. Is it possible that he did not see the absurdity of attempting to make Ignatius a witness against Episcopacy, whose testimony to a *hierarchy*, is so plain, and incontestable, and often repeated, as to have been itself the cause of inducing some learned men, and among them Episcopalians, to reject his authority altogether! But allow me, in relation to this question, to quote a writer whom you will, I am sure, at once allow to have no inducement whatever to represent it favorably to the view which Episcopalians have always taken of it, if not compelled to do so, by the controlling force of indisputable testimony.

The Rev. *James Smith*, of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, has recently written and published in our own city, a "History of the Christian Church." On p. 49 of that work the following impartial statement occurs.

"It must not be dissembled that different ranks and degrees appear to have been established from the very first among the ministers of religion. It is impossible to consider the Apostles, or even such eminent persons as Timothy, Titus, &c. as upon an entire footing with the generality of presbyters, or teachers in the different churches. From the Epistles of the primitive fathers, and particularly from those of St. Ignatius, it appears incontestably that the church government by the three distinct orders of bishops, presbyters and deacons, was fully established in the course of the first century: as each of these orders is particularly addressed, and as that father does not mention the institution as a novelty, there is the utmost reason to believe that this arrangement was made by the Apostles themselves. It must be remembered that Ignatius was the disciple of St. John, and suffered martyrdom at Rome so early as 107."

This statement is not only impartial, but, under the circumstances of his position, highly creditable to the author.*

But, after all that has been said on this subject, what is the value of all Dr. Miller's arguments about succession, if he gives the slightest degree of credit to the assertion of "the

* In the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, composed within two hundred years of the apostolic age, are regular lists of the Bishops of Jerusalem, of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, and other principal cities, copied from the records of those churches by Eusebius himself. He names thirty-two Bishops as having presided in the church of Jerusalem down to his own time, beginning with St. James. The first Bishop of Rome was Linus; of Alexandria, St. Mark; of Antioch, Evodius, of Ephesus, Timothy; of Crete, Titus; of Smyrna, Polycarp, the martyr—all of them ordained, and constituted Bishops of those places, by the apostles themselves.

eminent episcopal divine,"—"the learned and able prelatist," Dr. Barrow, that "the apostolical office in its nature and design, was *not successive, not communicable to others.*" Into such amazing inconsistencies is Dr. Miller driven by his inveterate animosity to Episcopacy.

Dr. Miller is so careless of his reputation for discretion and judgment, as to make deliberately the declaration, that, "*even if prelacy*"—a term, which, in defiance of the usage of all good writers, and of *all* Episcopalians especially, he continually substitutes for Episcopacy—"even if prelacy was found unequivocally represented as existing, by the Fathers, in fifty years after the last apostle, yet, if it be not found in the Bible, such testimony would by no means establish its apostolical appointment."* Again: "WE KNOW INDEED THAT NO SUCH TESTIMONY EXISTS."

It is more because of the air of confidence with which these assertions are made, than any power they have in themselves,

* "If from the very days of the apostles downwards, for more than fifteen hundred years, the order of the Church was uninterruptedly episcopal, as many advocates of episcopacy maintain," says the late eminent presbyterian, Dr. Mason, of New York, in his *Plea for Sacramental Communion*, p. 76, "although even such an argument could not be admitted against Scriptural proof, yet it would be extremely embarrassing to their opponents. The difficulty of explaining so strange a phenomenon, would create in conscientious men a fear that there must be some mistake in such a construction of holy writ as should be thwarted by it; and incline their minds to an interpretation with which it should be found to accord." He denies indeed, that any such difficulty exists, but upon this subject let me cite a disinterested witness, who treats it as a mere historical fact. Gibbon in his *Hist. of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. ii. p. 382, says, "after we have passed the difficulties of the first century,"—which terminated but little more than sixty years from the Crucifixion, about the time of the death of St. John, and fifty years before the canon of Scripture was made—"we find the Episcopal government universally established, till it was interrupted by the republican genius of the Swiss and German reformers."

that they are noticed here. The testimony of Jerome, even as given by Dr. M. himself, will be sufficient, with candid men, to refute the last; and he can have small pretensions to a rational judgment, who would insist upon the first. Let us see how writers of authority on his own side, i. e. writers who either were themselves Presbyterians, or not Episcopalians, consider this matter.

Dr. Durell, an English writer of authority, in his *View of the Foreign Reformed Churches*, (p. 161.) says of the celebrated Calvin: "For all that I have either seen of, or in him, or produced out of his writings, I am of this mind, that *Episcopacy* was the government that he approved most, and that he took it to be of *apostolical institution*."*

Martin Bucer, one of the most eminent of the continental Reformers, said; "By the perpetual observation of all churches, even from the *apostle's times*, we see, that it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, that, among presbyters, to whom the procuration of churches was chiefly committed, there should be one that should have the care or charge of divers churches, and the whole ministry committed to him; and by reason of that charge, he was above the rest; and therefore, the name of *bishop* was attributed peculiarly to those chief rulers." *How's Vindication*, p. 196.

Daille, the author of a celebrated work on *the Right use of the Fathers*, speaking of the English Bishops, said, "We confess that the foundation of their charge is good and lawful, established by the *apostles according to the command of Christ*." See *Bingham's French Church's Apology*.

Du Moulin, another eminent and learned French Protes-

* The following passages from Calvin and Beza have been often quoted in controversies of this nature. "If they would give us," says Calvin, "such a hierarchy, in which the bishops have such a pre-eminence as that they do not refuse to be subject unto Christ, then I will confess that they are worthy of all anathemas, if any such shall be found, who will not reverence it, and submit themselves to it with the utmost obedience." And Beza says, "if there be any who reject the whole order of *Episcopacy*, God forbid that any man of a sound mind should assent to the madness of such."

tant, in a professed defence of presbyterian government, yet admits, that, "*the Episcopal form of government, was received by all churches, every where, presently after the apostles' times, or even in their time, as ecclesiastical history witnesseth.*" *Adam's Religious World, vol. 2. Art. Episcopacy.*

Grotius, one of the most illustrious ornaments of the church of Holland, said, in his treatise on Church Government: "*Episcopacy had its beginning in the apostolical times. This is testified by the catalogues of bishops left us by Irenæus, Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoret and others, who all begin with the apostolical age.*" *Le Clerc*, also a member of the church of Holland, and editor of the celebrated work of *Grotius on the Truth of Christianity*, in his additions to that work, book i. sect. xi.—thus testifies on this subject: "They, who, without prejudice have read over the most ancient Christian writers that now remain, very well know, that *the Episcopal discipline, prevailed every where in the age immediately after the apostles; whence we may collect, that it is of apostolical institution. The other which they call Presbyterian, was instituted in many places of France, Switzerland, Germany and Holland, by those who in the sixteenth century made a separation from the church of Rome.*" These, be it remembered, are forced, not voluntary, admissions of men of unquestioned learning belonging to the Presbyterian churches, in those countries where such churches originated. Writers on the same side, that is, in favor of Presbyterianism, in England, Scotland, and our own country, though they have professed to speak of Episcopacy as introduced *after* the apostles' times, have never been able to agree upon the period of its introduction. *Campbell, Baxter, Dodridge, and Dr. Miller* assign very different periods. This fact is notorious. They also disagree as to the causes which produced the change. *Dr. Miller* chooses, in the abundance of his charity, to impute it to corruption; although it occurred, according to him, at a period, when, as history testifies, even the heathen enemies of the gospel speak of uncommon purity of life and principle, as the universal characteristic of its followers, and when eminence in the gospel cause only opened the way to persecution, suffering, and the flames!

The learned Bisop *Jeremy Taylor*, in allusion to the testimony of *Blondel*, who fixed the introduction at thirty-five years after the death of St. John, eloquently and truly says; “Now then, Episcopacy is confessed to be of about sixteen hundred years continuance;* and if before this they can show any ordination by mere presbyters; by any but an apostle, or an apostolical man;† and if there were not visibly a distinction of powers and persons relatively in the ecclesiastical government; or if they can give a rational account, why they who are forced to confess the honor and distinct order of Episcopacy for about sixteen ages, should, in the dark interval of thirty-five years, (in which they can pretend to no monument, or record, to the contrary) yet make unlearned scruples of things they cannot colourably prove; if, I say, they can reasonably account for these things, I, for my own part, will be ready to confess, that they are not guilty of the greatest, and most unreasonable schism in the world;‡ but else they have no colour to palliate THE UNLEARNED CRIME!” *Sermons vol. 3. p. 97.*

Such also was the light in which the *immortal Chillingworth*, the author of the noble axiom, *the Bible, and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants*, regarded this subject: “When”—said he—“I shall see all the fables of the metamorphosis acted, and prove true stories, when I shall see all the democracies in the world lie down and sleep, and awake into monarchies; then will I begin to believe, that presbyterial government, having continued in [the Church during the apostles’ times, should presently after, against the apostles doctrine and the will of Christ, be whirled about like a scene in a mask, and transformed into Episcopacy.—Episcopacy being granted to be ancient and universal, must be granted also to be apostolic.” *Works vol. 2. p. 537.*

The learned *Richard Hooker*, who, is on all sides, admitted to be the ablest writer on ecclesiastical subjects in our language, offered long since, in his profound work on Ecclesias-

*This was written in 1660. †Such as Barnabas, Timothy, &c.

‡This was written during the time of the Puritans, in England.

tical Polity, the following well known challenge, which, to this day, remains unanswered. "We require you to find out but one church, upon the face of the whole earth, that hath been ordered by your (presbyterian) discipline, or hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say, by Episcopal regiment, since the time that the blessed apostles were here conversant."* It is an indisputable fact that the opponents of Episcopacy have never yet been able to produce from Scripture, or antiquity, an instance of the joint action of a presbytery; or any act consistent with the idea that presbyters were only responsible to each other, and not to bishops.† There is a material differ-

*The learned and pious *Heber* uses very nearly the same language. See his Sermons in England p. 249-252.

† The only case ever pretended to be discovered, is alluded to by Dr. M. in another part of this chapter. The narrative in the beginning of Acts xiii. is alleged to have been an ordination of Paul and Barnabas, by men, none of whom were prelates. Those who participated in this act, are certainly not called apostles, nor bishops, but *prophets* and *teachers*. But is it possible, that men who examine into the facts of this case, can seriously maintain that it was *an ordination to any office* of the ministry? What then does Paul mean when he says of himself, that he was "an apostle, *not of men, neither by men*, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father." (Gal. i. 1.) Had not both Barnabas and Saul exercised their ministry before this time, in other places, as well as a whole year in the very city of Antioch, where this act took place? Are you prepared, Messrs Editors, to admit, in defiance of all Dr. M's. previous statements on that point, that Barnabas had now, by this act, become the equal of the apostles, and admitted jointly with Paul to that "peculiar and pre-eminent" rank? Or must Paul be now denied, for theory's sake, in opposition to his own claims oft repeated, to be himself, an apostle? But is it not more reasonable to suppose, that this was *no ordination to a ministerial office*, but merely a designation and separation to a special mission—the performance of which is fully recorded in Acts xiii. and xiv. "The Holy Ghost said separate me Barnabas and Saul for *the work whereunto I have called them*:—So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost departed"—visited sundry places where the gospel, probably, had not been preached—gathered churches—revisited some of them—ordained *elders* in every church, and then returned to Antioch, "from wher

ence between a mere *plurality* of presbyters, as in Ephesus, (Acts xx.) and their acting together as a *body* having *corporate* authority.—Nor is there, prior to the Reformation, an instance recorded in Ecclesiastical history, of any pretensions to the presbyterian mode of church government, as opposed to the episcopal, except that of *Aerius*, a presbyter of Sebastia in Pontus, a follower of the Arian heresy; and even he failed in his attempt to give currency to his opinions. Episcopacy has never been, in any instance, *deliberately* and *voluntarily* laid aside by any body of men on the face of the earth, with the exception of the English and Scottish presbyterians. The European continental reformers always justified their departure from episcopacy by the plea of *rigorous necessity*.

Dr. M. says that he can not only establish that there is no evidence in favor of diocesan episcopacy to be found in Scripture, but also that he can show that the testimony in favor of ministerial parity found in the New Testament, is clear and strong. As I do not intend to become the assailant of your system, I shall notice what he says on this subject, in a very brief way, and only as it has a bearing on Episcopacy.—He alleges that “nothing is plainer than that our blessed Lord severely rebuked, and explicitly condemned all contests among his ministering servants about rank and pre-eminence.” Undeniably:—but how does this prove that there was no rank or pre-eminence? On the contrary it rather takes for granted that there was. Why should men contend about what was neither in existence, nor in prospect?

Dr. M. perseveres, notwithstanding the contrary has been many times proved to him, in speaking of the Waldenses as not being Episcopalians, and as sustaining his views. A few brief quotations will be sufficient on this point. *Mosheim* says: (Cent. xii. chap. 5. sec. 13.) “The government of the church was committed, by the Waldenses to bishops, presbyters, and deacons; for they acknowledged that these three ecclesiastical orders were instituted by Christ himself.” Mr.

they had been recommended to the grace of God *for the work which they had fulfilled,*” and for which of course their commission was at an end.

Gilley in his account of his visit to the Waldenses, says: "Upon my enquiring of M. Peyrani whether there had not formerly been bishops, properly so called, in the Vaudois Church, he answered, yes."—In a communication made by M. Peyrani, then at the head of the Waldensian Church, to the London society, for propagating the Gospel in 1820, he expressed his regret at those misfortunes which had deprived the Waldensian Church of the benefit of an Episcopal government. (*Christian Observer*, 1820 p. 874.)—"The proofs which Mr. Sims adduces of there having been the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, among the ancient Vaudois, are ample and conclusive." (*Christ. Obs.* 1828. p. 254.) The late Dr. J. P. Wilson an eminent, and learned Presbyterian minister of Philadelphia, says of them: "The Waldenses—were covertly Episcopal, though after Claude, not papal; but never presbyterial, prior to the Helvetic abjuration of popery.—The Syrian Christians, the Culdees, and the Waldenses were all of Episcopal origin." *Christian Spectator*, New Haven, 1828, p. 57, 58.

Again:—Dr. M. says, without any qualification whatever: "It is acknowledged, by the great mass of learned and pious men, of all Protestant denominations, that it is plain from the apostolical writings, that the ecclesiastical order of the synagogue was transferred by inspired men to the christian church." It is difficult to suppose that Dr. M. could have been mistaken upon this subject; yet, if otherwise, his reading must have been very limited in relation to it; so much so indeed as to render his opinion worthy of little confidence on the subject. "All impartial judges"—says the *Christian Observer* (1804.) "will admit that he has the best of the argument, who contends that the government of the primitive church was formed upon the model of the *Jewish Priesthood*. That this was understood by the *early Christians* to be the case, is not denied even by the prejudiced Mosheim." (See his *Ecc. Hist.* cent. 2, chap. 2. sect. 4.) The Synagogue was, in fact, only a *human institution* made for the purpose of extending a knowledge of the law among the people: its officers were an angel, rulers or presbyters (a kind of civil magistrate) and

deacons, but it had no sacrifices or sacraments. Its ministers had no sacred character, and performed no duties of divine institution. Its analogy with the Christian Church is therefore much more than doubtful. But even if the Church had been modeled upon the plan of the Synagogue, the opponents of Episcopacy would gain no advantage, for there would still be a great and necessary difference between them. The Jews had in every large city, for instance, many synagogues, *each* of which had its distinct government; but still the temple with its priesthood was the centre of unity; and although it is obvious that there were several Christian congregations in the larger cities, yet in Scripture we always read not of churches, but *the Church*. Take the case of Jerusalem, for instance; when Paul and Barnabas visited that city, there must have been a much larger number of Christians than could have assembled in any one place, yet we find that, however many congregations there may have been; there was but one Church; and though there were many *elders*, there was but one president or *bishop*. No one will say that we are told of any such thing as an organized presbytery in *the Church* at Jerusalem. It is the opinion of the ablest, and soundest writers on the subject, that the Church at Jerusalem was modeled from the *temple*, and, that that Church served as the model for all others. Nevertheless, Dr. M. perseveres in saying that: "It is evident on the slightest inspection of the New Testament history, that the names and functions of the church officers appointed by the apostles, were derived, not from the temple, but from the synagogue"!

Again. "It is explicitly granted, by our Episcopal brethren themselves, that in the New Testament, the titles *Bishop* and *Presbyter* were used interchangeably, to designate the same office, and that the names were then common." True, but they also assert, and prove, moreover, that there was a superior order called *Apostles*, which had jurisdiction over the *Bishops* or *Presbyters*, and that the names of these officers were subsequently changed; of which I have given evidence, in the former part of this Letter.

Again. "It is manifest, that Timothy received his designa-

tion to the sacred office "by the laying on of the hands of the *presbytery*.' It cannot be manifest that he was so designated by their hands *only*, while such a passage remains as that in Paul's second epistle to Timothy, 1. 6. "*Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the laying on of my hands.*" This passage must first be obliterated from our Bibles.

"It is well known," says Dr. M. that, "at the era of the Reformation, the leaders of the church of England stood *alone*, in reforming their church upon prelatival (i. e. Episcopal) principles."* Indeed! I have hitherto supposed, and certainly all

* Dr. M. gives a very unjust account of "the principles which formed the dividing lines between the Puritans of England, and the Prelates and others by whom the Reformed church was organized in that land." He says that "the Puritans contended that the Bible was the only infallible rule of faith and practice, that it ought to be regarded as the standard of church government and discipline as well as of doctrine etc.,—But the Bishops and court clergy—[by which courteous appellation he means the Episcopalians]—openly maintained that the Scriptures were not to be considered as the only standard of church government and discipline: that the Fathers and the early councils were to be united with them as the rule; that the Saviour and his apostles left the whole matter of church order to be accommodated to the discretion of the civil magistrate, etc." Every intelligent reader of the history of that period will at once perceive the manifest injustice of this statement. The Puritans contended "that God had given *in the Scriptures, a complete and unchangeable form*, for the government both of Church and State." "The Church," said Cartwright, their great leader, "wherein any magistrate, king, or emperor, is a member, is divided into some that are to govern, as *pastors, doctors, and elders*, and into such as are to obey, as *magistrates of all sorts*, and the people."—The Episcopalians contended, on the other hand, that there is not, in Scripture, *any detailed and prescribed system of church government*, but that the form of church government, may differ, and has differed, in different ages, and countries, without affecting the faith, or the ministry of the gospel; and that it is the duty of all Christians, in civil matters, to submit to the powers that be, as ordained of God. Episcopalians still distinguish between *the essential character of the ministry* in three orders, Bishops, priests, and deacons, and *church government*; they hold the former to be a divine institution, but church govern-

history confirms the supposition, that the churches of Denmark and Sweden were also reformed upon Episcopal principles. Whatever may be said of Knox, and some others whom

ment with these may comprise other offices,—as in this country, wardens and vestrymen for attending to the temporal business of the Church:—It may comprise also the mode by which ministers are vested with jurisdiction; and the particular organization of her legislative, executive and judiciary powers. As these latter things are left to human expediency, and may be ordered differently in different churches, they do not contend, strictly speaking, for the divine institution of Episcopal government. The Presbyterian church in this country, carries this subject much farther than the Episcopal, for it asserts in its Form of Government, that; “the character, qualifications, and authority of church officers are laid down in the Holy Scriptures, as well as the proper method of their investiture and institution,” and reference is made to Scripture for the purpose of sustaining its claim to divine right for its *whole system* of government, in all its parts, officers, presbyters, synods, etc. etc.

It may be well to add here, to prevent misunderstanding, that by *divine right*, or *appointment*, we do not mean an express command of God, or of our blessed Saviour; nor, in this sense, can the Christian Sabbath, nor infant baptism, nor the canon of Scripture, be said to have the sanction of divine institution; but that may be said to be divinely instituted which is delivered by men divinely inspired; as are all the precepts and ordinances which we have received from the prophets and apostles by divine inspiration; and the same may be said of whatever is founded upon a divine commission, as the preaching of the gospel, and the administration of the sacraments. It must be conceded, on all sides, that the Christian ministry is in these two last senses a divine institution, and this is all we claim for Episcopacy.

Calamy, in his *Life of Baxter*, vol. i. p. 141, says that the Presbyterian ministers who met at Sion college in 1660, on the restoration of Charles II., after much deliberation, presented to the king a paper in which “they offered to allow of the *true ancient primitive presidency* [Episcopacy] in the Church, with a due mixture of presbyters”—and that for reforming existing evils “they proposed Bishop Usher’s Reduction of Episcopacy.” Neal also mentions the same circumstance. He says, (*Hist. of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 567.) “the *well meaning* presbyterians” offered as a plan of accommodation with the Episcopalians, Archbishop Usher’s mode of primitive Episcopacy. Dr. Mason, in his *Plea for Sacramen-*

he names, it is a fact, which any reader of ecclesiastical history may verify, that Luther, Melancthon, and Bucer did not interpret the New Testament as plainly teaching the doctrine of parity, nor “regard every kind of imparity in the gospel ministry as the result of human contrivance, and not of divine appointment.” *Luther* himself declared that “if the popish bishops would cease to persecute the gospel, we would acknowledge them as our Fathers, and willingly obey *their authority, which we find supported by the word of God:*”* and *Melancthon*, in the *Apology* for the Augustan Confession, says, “I would to God it lay in me to restore the government of bishops.” And *Mosheim* says; † “The internal government of the Lutheran Church seems equally removed from episco-

al Communion, p. 275, in describing this *plan*, says, “its chief feature is, that, without destroying the distinctive titles of archbishop, bishop, and presbyter, as known in England, they [the presbyters] might be *conjoined* in the government of the Church; a bishop being perpetual president in the ecclesiastical assemblies made up of presbyters.” It is a curious incident in the history of parties, that while this plan of Usher’s, which has been, at times, so much lauded by anti-episcopalians, and which would have satisfied the English *well meaning* presbyterians, although it certainly would have been a *reduction* of English Episcopacy as it then stood, takes undeniably higher ground in regard to government than the Episcopal church of this country. Usher’s plan excluded from the government of the church all but bishops and presbyters. Neither deacon, nor layman, would have been allowed to interfere or associate with them, and the decrees of such synods might have been expected to be as absolute and as tyrannical as those of any bishop in Christendom. Oligarchies have surely been found to be as oppressive to the rights of the governed, as any monarchy or despotism that ever existed. The American Episcopal Church contending for divine right simply for its three orders of ministers, allows each of those orders, and the whole body of the laity by delegates of their own annual choice, to share in its government. Its bishops, who constitute, severally, in their own dioceses, its executive, are bound by written law, and can no more exercise power beyond that law than the humblest member of the flock.

* See How’s *Vindication*, p. 176. † *Hist. cent. xvi. part 2. chap. 1. sect. 4.*

pacy, on the one hand, and from prebyterianism on the other; if we except the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark, who retain the form of government (episcopal) which preceded the Reformation, purged indeed from the abuses and superstitions that rendered it so odious."

In reference to Dr. M's. assertion that Episcopalians also "depart from the apostolic mode in respect to the deacon's office," perhaps enough has been said in the previous pages of this Letter. One circumstance only deserves notice here. Dr. Miller is put to much difficulty to reconcile the fact of Philip, the deacon, "being found preaching and baptising in Samaria and other places," with the character, which he chooses to consider as properly belonging to the office of deacon. In this situation, he *imagines*, without the slightest ground for it, that Philip must have received ordination to the *presbytery*; "for," he absurdly asks, "are not cases frequently occurring in the presbyterian church, in which young men, after serving a year or two as deacons, or ruling elders, are set apart as ministers of the gospel?" True, Philip is called an *Evangelist*. But Evangelists were not an order: deacons might be such. Is it not strange, after so much said of the inability of his Episcopal brethren to produce *direct testimony from Scripture*—after asserting that their testimony was only *indirect and remotely inferential*"—that Dr. M. should hazard a mere, literal, wholly unsupported, conjecture, as conclusive testimony! Let us try him with his own "regular syllogism," which he made for the benefit of Episcopalians, in the case of Timothy and Titus, in the former part of this chapter. "None but presbyters can preach and baptise; but Philip preached and baptized; therefore Philip must have been a presbyter!" But, as Dr. M. said in the former case, "is not the very thing to be proved;" viz: that deacons could not preach and baptise "here taken for granted? Can there be a more gross begging of the whole question than this argument exemplifies?"—"Until it be proved that Philip preached and baptized as a deacon!"—why, it is most abundantly proved, not by *indirect and remote*, but by the *direct testimony of Scripture*, that he was ordained a *deacon*—that he did *preach and baptise*, and that he is called *at the same*

time a deacon and evangelist:—“Philip the evangelist, one of the seven” (Acts xxi. 8.) What other proof does Dr. M. desire? Much, it would seem; for he now quotes—reckless of his own denunciation of all such testimony, in the former part of this chapter,—Origen, and Ambrose, and Chrysostom, and even the *apostolical constitutions*, as testimony in relation to the Scripture office of deacon! The actual perusal of his statements, alone, can make it credible, that he has resorted to such a manifest inversion of his own declared principles!

But allow me to introduce here another brief extract from Mr. Smith’s *History of the Church*; in relation to the office of deacon. Belonging himself to a religious body, which, like that of which Dr. Miller is a member, takes a different view of the duties of this office, from that which is taken by the Episcopal church, yet he has regarded truth, as more valuable than a mere party or sectarian triumph, and has given, accordingly, such an account, as is consistent alike with Scripture, and the uniform testimony of ecclesiastical history.

“An inferior order of ministers, called deacons, were appointed from the first institution of the Church, whose office it was to assist in the administration of the Lord’s supper, to carry the elements to the sick and absent, to receive the oblations of the people, to rebuke those who behaved irreverently during divine service, to relieve the distressed, and to watch over the conduct of the people. In some churches they also read the Gospels, and were allowed to baptise and to preach. The number of these ministers was not limited, but was generally in proportion to the wants of the Church. Some, however, after the example of the church at Jerusalem, confined their number to seven; and the church of Rome thought this rule so obligatory, that when the number of presbyters amounted to forty-six, that of the deacons was limited to seven.” p. 49.

Dr. Miller tells us in this fourth chapter, that the burthen of proof in relation to Episcopacy, rests with Episcopalians. If this were admitted to be just, with reference to the world at large, yet upon what grounds can it be thrown upon us, with reference to Presbyterians? They were challenged, more than one hundred and fifty years ago, in that immortal work

of Hooker, which, at this day, is found upon the desk of every *divine*, to show an instance in the whole world, of a church governed otherwise than episcopally, from the apostles' times to the Reformation, and the fact yet remains to be shown! There is no probability that such a fact ever can be shown. Episcopalians have a right to take the ground,—that, as in the case of the Scriptures, on which they found all their doctrines, and all their hopes,—as an *existing* institution, through its whole period claimed to be co-existent with Christianity, (whose enemies, and in later times they have not been few, have never yet been able to agree on any period subsequent to the apostles for its origin,) they have the *presumption* in their favor, and such a pre-occupation of the ground, as that Episcopacy must stand good, till some sufficient reason is adduced against it; in short, that the burden of proof lies not with us, but with our adversaries.*

A brief recapitulation, or arrangement of some of Dr. Miller's propositions will close what I have to say at this time. If any one should think it difficult to reconcile these propositions, as they are here presented, I beg it may be remembered, that the fault is not mine. I believe they faithfully represent his own declarations. The references are to the pages of this letter.

1. The apostolical office was not successive (p. 21.)—the presbyters succeeded in the place of the bench of the apostles (p. 21.)—Presbyterian ruling elders are such presbyters (p. 36.)—all who are empowered to preach the gospel and administer sacramental seals are successors of the apostles. (p. 36.)
 2. The writings of Ignatius are unworthy of confidence as genuine works (p. 6.)—they are in the main, the real works of another whose name they bear (p. 6.)—again, they are unworthy of confidence (p. 6.)—contain a graphic description of Presbyterianism as existing in all the churches he addresses.

3. The *Confession* of the *Confession* lived four centuries after the apostolic age, and therefore are not to be trusted as to a fact which occurred dur-

4. *Whately's Rhetoric*, p. 79.

ing that age (p. 19.)—the learned Jerome, and Origen, and Augustine, and Ambrose, and Chrysostom, and the apostolical constitutions, of about the same time; and Dr. Barrow sixteen centuries after, are authorities for facts during the apostolic age p. 51 & 16.)

4. Episcopalians do not pretend to quote a single passage of Scripture which declares in so many words, in favor of their claim (p. 11.)—whoever expects to find any formal or explicit declarations on the subject of the ministry delivered by Christ or his apostles, will be disappointed—the Scriptures present no formal or explicit declarations on the subject. (p. 11.)

5. The advocates of Episcopacy refer us to no passages of Scripture asserting or even hinting that diocesan bishops succeed the apostles in the appropriate powers and pre-eminence of the apostolic character (p. 7.)—Episcopalians commonly urge from Scripture that Timothy was bishop of Ephesus, and Titus of Crete,—that the angels addressed in the epistles to the seven churches, were bishops,—that the apostle James was bishop of Jerusalem;—that the New Testament holds forth as existing in the apostolic church, and intended to be perpetual, an order of men superior to presbyters—they would persuade us not only that the New Testament bears them out in maintaining the actual existence of such an order in the apostolic church, but also that it warrants them in contending for it as perpetually and indispensably binding. p. 26 &c.

6. No testimony of the Fathers exists which unequivocally represents Episcopacy as existing within fifty years from the last apostle, (p. 39.)—Jerome declares it was brought in at the time when jealousies began among the presbyters of Corinth in the absence of *St. Paul*. (p. 31.)

I have referred to the previous pages of this Letter for such passages as I have found occasion to quote in my replies. One or two of them, which I have not previously quoted, you can find, without difficulty, on examining your own columns.

I have been led to extend this letter, only intended originally to comprise a few paragraphs, to a considerable length. It is time I should bring it to a close.

I trust, however much I may have been tempted by the recklessness of Dr. Miller's assertions and invective, to depart from my avowed design of acting on the defensive only, I shall be found to have strictly adhered to it. I have been anxious only to vindicate the church of which I am a member, from the sweeping reproach, which you have assisted Dr. M. in attempting to fix upon her, of *being utterly destitute of Scriptural warrant for her long established institutions*. I trust, that the effort will not have been made in vain. What advantage Dr. Miller's oft repeated assaults upon his "Episcopal brethren" as he calls them, may have brought to your own church, I have no means of knowing, but I can safely declare, that there is, probably, no man living, who has been the means of attaching so many individuals to the Episcopal church, as Dr. M.: not intentionally—I fully acquit him of that charge—but indirectly. His writings have undeniably led more persons to investigate the subject of the ministry, than those of any other person of our day. I freely state the fact, that there are annually admitted to the ministry of the Episcopal church, not a few persons whose religious education was acquired elsewhere. No small portion of the present ministers of the Episcopal Church, including four of her present bishops, were educated in other denominations, and have attached themselves to her from convictions formed in manhood, and after an examination of the points of controversy connected with ecclesiastical history. Some of these passed through the halls of the seminary, where Dr. Miller himself dogmatizes,—they heard his arguments from his own lips, and were led by the manifestations of his feelings, similar to those of which I have spoken in this Letter, to examine the subject, fully and deliberately, for themselves. We have among us some, who had even exercised the ministry elsewhere, for longer or shorter periods, and who upon their examination of this subject, were induced to change their connexions and ecclesiastical allegiance. Of the eleven ministers of the Episcopal Church now in this State, eight have been led by their convictions, at the sacrifice of some feeling, so far to separate from their early connexions, as to cast in their lot among us.

I do not mention these facts as cause of triumph; the subject is unfit for the manifestation of such a feeling; but to show that we do not think ourselves likely to lose ground, even by the widest possible discussion of the subject.

And now allow me, Messrs, Editors, to ask of you a candid consideration of what I have now felt it my duty to lay before you. I have not written in an angry or sectarian spirit, and I trust that what I have written may not excite any such spirit in others. May the great Head of the Church overrule all our differences for its advancement, and for setting forward the salvation of all men.

AN EPISCOPALIAN.

June 12th, 1835.

P. S. After a considerable portion of the above *Letter* was written, a friend put into my hands, a copy of the work of Dr. Miller, the republication of the fourth chapter of which has called forth these strictures. A single glance over its pages is sufficient to show, that it fully sustains the allegation of Dr. Miller's motives made by me on page 4th of this *Letter*. To make no reference to the first three chapters, or to what has been said above of the fourth chapter, the following heads of the fifth, will be sufficient evidence of the AGGRESSIVE character of the whole. This chapter, though bearing the title of "the worship of the *Presbyterian church*," is divided into sections with the following titles,—Presbyterians REJECT prescribed Liturgies:—do not observe holy days:—REJECT godfathers and godmothers in baptism:—the sign of the cross in baptism:—the rite of confirmation:—kneeling at the Lord's supper:—administering the Lord's supper in private:—bowing at the name of Jesus:—reading the apocryphal books in public worship. As, under all these heads, the burden of reference and of defence, is thrown upon the Episcopal church, it would seem that Dr. Miller supposes that Presbyterianism, is only to be sustained by the destruction of the Episcopal church. His determination seems to be that of "the children of Edom in the day of Jerusalem, who said, Rase it, rase it, even to the foundation thereof." It is not easy to conceive why the Editors of the American Presbyterian, themselves connected with one of the most influential denominations in this region of country, should find it needful to join in such a warfare against a mere handful—comparatively—of Episcopalians. They seem, however, disposed to avail themselves thoroughly of Dr. Miller's wea-

pons, and to allow their paper to be the vehicle of gross imputations upon the principles and practices of those, who, at the same time, they call their "Episcopal brethren!" Anxious only for truth, when they shall have accomplished their weekly task of giving circulation to Dr. Miller's charitable labors, I may find it convenient to trouble them with another letter.

A

LETTER

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

IN NASHVILLE;

CONTAINING A REPLY TO A PUBLICATION OF THE

REV. SAMUEL MILLER, D. D.

IN THE AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN OF SEPTEMBER 3d,
1835, AND IN SOME OTHER PAPERS.

BY GEORGE WELLER, D. D.

RECTOR OF CHRIST CHURCH, NASHVILLE.

NASHVILLE:
PRINTED BY S. NYE & CO.

.....

1836.



A LETTER

*To the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in
Nashville.*

Dear Brethren—An article or communication of unusual length for the mode of publication, by the Rev. *Dr. Samuel Miller*, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey, appeared in the *American Presbyterian* of this City, on the 3d of September last, and since, I learn, in some other religious papers,—to which I think it necessary in this manner to call your attention,

I had at first contemplated only a brief reply to Dr. Miller's animadversions upon our church and myself, through the columns of the same paper in which Dr. Miller's communication was published. Permission to do this, was, however, discourteously refused by the Editors of the *American Presbyterian*, on the alleged ground that they did "*not know how far the proposed reply would be respectful to Dr. Miller or themselves!*" As the existing controversy, in our vicinity, according to their own admission, as will be seen in the sequel, had been commenced by themselves, it would seem that civility, apart from justice and christian charity, would have allowed me the use of those columns, through which, alone, my defence against accusations of a personal

and serious nature, could reach those before whom those accusations had been fully spread. I must, however, do the editors the justice of believing, that they may have conceived it difficult for me to make any suitable reply to Dr. Miller's numerous personalities, which should be *respectful to him* without departing from the respect which I owed to *myself*.

You are, of course, aware, that a work written by Dr. Miller, and containing many uncharitable, unjust, and even false, imputations upon the principles and practices of our beloved church, had been unnecessarily brought before this community, by the Editors of the *American Presbyterian* through the columns of their paper during many successive weeks, to the disturbance of our peace, and leading to the formation, with those who should give credit to Dr. Miller's statements, of very unfavorable opinions, in relation to our religious principles, practices, and character.

It was impossible that a publication of this nature, and under these circumstances, could have been passed by unnoticed by us, consistently with self respect, or with the desire to obtain and hold the respect of the community around us. If the allegations thus applied directly to *us* and *our* principles by those editors were true, it would only have been an honest act in the community to deprive us of their confidence, and hold us up to the world as a reproach upon the Gospel. A writer, believed to be one of the editors of the *American Presbyterian*, did indeed subsequently endeavor to do this through the columns of that paper, in an article evincing little else than ignorance and malignity, with the signature of *A Catholic*.

It was under these circumstances, that, with the concurrence of some among you, I wrote hastily, for as you know I have little leisure for such employment, a *Letter to the Editors of the American Presbyterian*, in which I examined, censured, and, as is believed, refuted, so much of Dr. Miller's

allegations as related to the episcopal constitution of the christian ministry.

To leave no doubt upon the minds of their readers, that these *editors* were desirous to produce an unfavorable impression on the public mind, in relation to our principles and practice; and of their disposition to begin a controversy, the effects of which they have since shown an unequivocal desire to avoid, they distinctly admitted in their paper of July 9th, that such was their object. At least their language was so understood both here and elsewhere. They certainly endeavored, with far less knowledge of our institutions than Dr. Miller has shown, to strengthen his statements by very gross misrepresentations of our church, in their papers of July 9th and 23d last; which, though entirely disproved to them, they have not had the magnanimity to retract.

My *Letter to the Editors* met with no reply from them. It is understood that a copy was sent to Dr. Miller, with a request that he would come to their aid. More compassionate than Hercules in the fable, he does not seem even to have asked of them to put their own shoulders to the wheel, but forthwith undertook, with characteristic alacrity, the whole labor. The result of his efforts was the communication above referred to, in the *American Presbyterian* of September 3d, and which I now propose to examine.

Dr. Miller commences his communication by a *palpable misrepresentation*. He says that I “begin by representing him as *entirely the aggressor in all that he has written on the episcopal controversy for twenty years past*, as well as recently.” He says that I speak of *him* “as guilty of an ‘unprovoked assault,’ on the Episcopal Church; as having ‘cherished a long, continued and vehement animosity towards it.’” Any man who has perused the *Letter* of “*an Episcopalian*” may readily perceive how far this statement varies from the fact. That I asserted his long continued and ve-

hement animosity to the Episcopal Church is true, and I am amazed that he would even seem to deny a fact, so well known to all who are at all acquainted with his history. I now deliberately repeat it, and shall, I think, before I close these strictures, make it abundantly evident to all who may doubt it. But a reference to the *Letter* p. 4. will show that it was the *Editors of the American Presbyterian* whom I accused of the *unprovoked assault*, because while Episcopalians were few in number and living in peace by their side, they had chosen to avail themselves of Dr. Miller's labors to misrepresent our principles, and deny our claims to scriptural sanction for them; and, if I understand the language of these Editors in their paper of July 9th last, they distinctly admit that it was an assault on their part. They suppose some one to ask the question, "why have we republished Dr. M's. tract in which the validity of Episcopacy is questioned and impugned?" Their *chief* object, they reply, was to show that Presbyterians stood on as good ground as others; and the next, that Episcopalians hold some opinions which they thought it necessary to assail. I repeat that the republication of Dr. Miller's Tract was, on the part of these Editors, *an unprovoked assault* upon their Episcopal brethren.

But in what part of the *Letter* is Dr. M. charged with being entirely the aggressor in all that he has written on this controversy during the twenty years past? I am unable to find any such passage. There is no such assertion in it. I do indeed charge him with being the aggressor in this *Tract*; and I refer to the contents of the *Tract* itself to prove my charge. The following passage occurs, not as he states, at the *beginning*, but in the *postscript* of the *Letter*.

"To make no reference to the first three chapters (of Dr. Miller's *Tract*,) or to what has been said above of the fourth chapter, the following heads of the fifth, will be sufficient evidence of the **AGGRES-**

sive character of the whole. This chapter, though bearing the title of "the worship of the *Presbyterian church*," is divided into sections with the following titles,—Presbyterians REJECT *prescribed Liturgies*:—do not observe holy days:—REJECT *godfathers and godmothers in baptism*:—the sign of the cross in baptism:—the rite of confirmation:—kneeling at the Lord's supper:—administering the Lord's supper in private:—bowing at the name of Jesus:—reading the apocryphal books in public worship. As, under all these heads, the burden of reference and of defence, is thrown upon the Episcopal church, it would seem that Dr. Miller supposes that Presbyterianism is only to be sustained by the destruction of the Episcopal church."

In this short paragraph then, the second in his communication, Dr. M. has made no less than three misrepresentations.

1st. I did *not* charge *him* with an unprovoked assault on the Episcopal church, but the editors of the American Presbyterian.

2d. I did *not* charge him "with being entirely the aggressor in all that he had written on the Episcopal controversy for twenty years past."

3d. And though I *did* assert, that his Tract was *aggressive*, it was not in the *beginning* of my Letter, but in the *post-script*.

The *purpose* for which Dr. M. charges me with representing him as entirely the aggressor in all that he has written on the Episcopal controversy for twenty years past, is, to enable him to make an attempt to justify his course of opposition to our beloved church during that long period. He then makes a statement of his views of the cause and origin of this controversy, from about the year 1805; which is such a view as none but a man prejudiced, and deeply committed in its character, could have taken, or could have consented to lay before the public. It furnishes another strong proof of his persevering animosity towards the Episcopal

church. While he admits, that, if I have read the books which I have quoted in my *Letter to the Editors of the American Presbyterian*, I “must have been acquainted with the facts;” he says, that his statement “cannot be disputed, because the evidence of it is on record, and open to the examination of every honest enquirer.” It is true, that the evidence is on record; and that I am acquainted with it, not from the records only, but also from the fact, that, about the time of the commencement of *his* assault upon the Episcopal church, I was very near what he chooses to call the *very focal heat* of this controversy—felt at the time, as a young enquirer, no little interest in it—was not then sufficiently connected with either party to be divested of the capacity for impartial observation,—and yet preserve a tolerably fresh recollection of the occurrences of the time. I shall now give, with occasional references to “evidence on record,” my view of these matters, which will be seen to differ essentially from Dr. M’s. representation.

“The point of the focal heat” was the city of New York.

Between the years 1803 and 1805, the late Bishop Hobart, of New York, then a young man, and holding the station of assistant minister of Trinity church, in that city, revised and published in that city, two works, which had long before been published, and passed through many editions, in England, viz: Stevens’ Essay on the nature and constitution of the Christian Church; and Nelson’s Companion for the Festivals and Fasts. To these he added a Companion for the Altar. These books were published by him expressly for the use of members of the Episcopal church. There was nothing in them which was not to be met with in hundreds of English works, in free circulation, both in England and this country, at that period. These identical works are now to be seen in every corner of our land, and I am confident that those of you who are acquaint-

ed with the last two, and have used them in your devotional exercises for a series of years, will hear with incredulity, that these are the "books and pamphlets" which, Dr. Miller says, "had been sent abroad with much assiduity for more than a year before they were noticed by any Presbyterian," and have led to near thirty years of unrelenting hostilities on the part of Dr. Miller!

What, it may be asked, was the tenor of any part of these publications, that they should stir up such enduring strife? Simply that any reference was made in them to Episcopacy, as a valid and apostolic form of the ministry; a doctrine which Dr. M. and his friends had chosen to consider as exploded. Conversely, it was the same with the 4th art. of the xxvii ch. of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith: which says, "*There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord, in the Gospel: neither of which may be dispensed by any but by a minister of the word, lawfully ordained.*" Episcopalians and Presbyterians equally admit this doctrine, and only disagree as to what order of men are the *lawful* ordainers: the first contend that it is the order of Bishops alone; the other that it is the order of Presbyters alone. Dr. Hobart asserted the Episcopal opinion, and in thus doing he committed a sin, which, in the eyes of Dr. Miller, is never to be forgiven or forgotten. At this period, when the heat of that day, at least, has passed, any one may see, that those works contain nothing in regard to other churches, resembling the view, which Dr. M. has chosen to spread through the columns of the *American Presbyterian*.

The works above named, had been but a short time in circulation, before they attracted the attention of Dr. *J. B. Linn*, a Presbyterian clergyman of distinguished talents, then residing in the city of Albany. He saw fit to attack them, and the whole Episcopal system, through a public political newspaper. 'This was the tocsin—the first overt

act in the controversy. Episcopacy, it had been supposed, was slowly and surely descending to its grave. For a long time, none had dared to lift up a voice in favor of that religious system, which, both before and after the Revolution, hands almost gigantic, had been raised to crush. But vigor was now demonstrated to be yet remaining in the system, and it had displayed itself in the very spot, where, if sustained at all, it must acquire power and influence. The young Episcopal aspirant was therefore discovered to be a dangerous man. Dr. Linn was an accomplished scholar, and an eminent man. He was, therefore, placed in the front rank. Doubtless to his surprise, Dr. Linn was soon himself beset by two other opponents, Dr. *Beasley*, since Provost of the University of Pennsylvania; and a layman of Utica, in the same State, of distinguished talents, of the name of *How*. The several papers of these three writers were soon after collected into a volume, by an Episcopal editor, with the title of *Essays on Episcopacy*. A powerful alarm was now excited, and the late Dr. *John M. Mason*, of New York, another distinguished Presbyterian minister, was induced to establish a magazine, for the purpose of carrying on the warfare to better advantage, in "the very point of the focal heat." Much of this publication was occupied with assaults on every tower of Episcopacy. The first and second numbers contained severe reviews of Hobart's *Companion for the Altar*, and the *Essays on Episcopacy*. Those who remember the distinguishing traits of the editor's character, will easily believe that this publication was not very likely to contribute to peace, or exhibit any considerable degree of respect for either the opinions or the persons of those whom he opposed. Yet Episcopal writers of that period were of opinion, that the cause of Episcopacy derived strength from the assaults of Drs. Linn and Mason.—Assailed, personally, by such powerful talents, Dr. Hobart was

compelled to appear in self-defence. This he did, in an eloquent *Apology for Apostolic order*; and this, in the year 1807, was followed by *Dr. Miller's* celebrated *Letters on the Ministry*. Of this work, it was said, on its first appearance, and by one who it is believed had opportunity for knowing the fact, that there was "good reason to believe, it had been the labor of *some years*. We shall not demand," said the same writer, "as long to answer it; and if it cannot be proved to be full of sophistry, inconsistency, misstatements, and misrepresentation, let Episcopacy forever hide its head. The advocate of Episcopacy fears only that prejudice, which hears one party, and turns a deaf ear to the other."

Dr. Miller's work received, soon after its publication, three several replies from the pens of *Dr. Bowden*, *Dr. Kemp*, and *Dr. How*. So little was he himself *then* satisfied with the result, that he closed his second volume, in which he attempted an answer to the sweeping proofs of *Bowden* and *How*, with the expression of a resolution, that he would engage no more in the Episcopal controversy.

Such is a brief, but faithful sketch of the history of this controversy, which *Dr. Miller* has so much misrepresented. *Dr. Hobart's* books, to which *Dr. M.* traces its origin, were not controversial, or intended to excite any controversial feelings in others. Two of them were indeed devotional, and strictly intended for the appropriate use of Episcopalians. The controversy began with *Dr. Linn*, on the Presbyterian side. There was no "attack by Episcopalians on non Episcopal churches," as *Dr. M.* asserts; and, on the other hand, his own language, in the very article now before us, in the *American Presbyterian*, with regard to his share in the controversy, is, that he wrote his *Letters on the Ministry* "not to assail or injure his Episcopal brethren; but simply to show that their exclusive claims were unfounded." Very

kind of him, indeed! but Dr. Hobart's books, which, he says, commenced the controversy, were not even written to show that the exclusive claims of his Presbyterian brethren were unfounded; but simply to instruct Episcopalians in their own religious duties.

Enough has been said to show where the controversy began, and who are to be charged with any trouble it may have produced; but it may be well to add Dr. Miller's own plain testimony on this subject, written at a time when there was no necessity for disguising the truth in the matter; a testimony which Dr. M. himself seems to have forgotten, for it adds another to his many very strange inconsistencies in connexion with Episcopacy. On p. 51 of his *Continuation of Letters on the Ministry*, written more than twenty years ago, he deliberately recorded the following declaration in reference to the Episcopal and other churches: "*Presbyterians have been in the habit of writing, preaching, and printing against their corruptions;*" and if this does not mean that Presbyterians had been in the practice, for years previously to the publication of Dr. Hobart's books, of assailing the Episcopal church, I should be glad to be informed what it does mean. This, his own declaration, in my judgment, fully refutes all he has said upon the subject of the origin of the controversy, in the columns of the *American Presbyterian*.

The result of this controversy on the public mind, was a large immediate increase of members of the Episcopal church, in various parts of the country, especially in the more eastern States, and the accession from other bodies of several who have since ranked among the most useful and talented of her clergy. These facts are within my own personal knowledge.

One would suppose from Dr. Miller's statements, that the Episcopal principle had never been asserted or contend-

ed for till the publications of Dr. Hobart. Yet he himself admits that Episcopacy existed in the church as early as the fourth century,—and the principle has been ever since asserted and contended for, almost, indeed, universally; and to the full height to which it was carried by Dr. Hobart's publications! In England, especially, has this been the case. *Mosheim*, a Lutheran, tells us, that “the church of England has constantly insisted on the divine origin of its government and discipline.” These facts are well known to every one who has any knowledge of ecclesiastical history. How can any one, then, have the assurance to assert, that the free and open declaration of a principle which has prevailed in the world as long as christianity itself, and among by far the larger proportion of the followers of Christ in the whole world, can be in any sense of the word, an *assault*, or an *aggression*? It is by Dr. Miller and his coadjutors, and supporters, that the assault and aggression is made, for they, and not Episcopal writers, have asserted new and strange principles, have dissented from, and endeavored [to overturn, the universally received doctrine.

Dr. Miller says, that he had no sooner made the publication of his *Letters on the Ministry*—which, let it be remembered, were, by his own admission, intended to show his *Episcopal brethren that their exclusive claims were unfounded*—than “he was vehemently attacked, and in some instances with gross indecorum, by three or four assailants whose works abounded with what may not improperly be called personal abuse.” This is much in Dr. Miller's own manner. He does not aim so much, in general, to show that his adversary is wrong, by fair and manly argument, as by bold assertion, and unsparing and reproachful imputations. He is more anxious to wake up in the mind of the reader a feeling against his opponent, than to prove him, by conclusive and allowed testimony, to be in the wrong. Specimens

of his talent in this way abound in the article now before us in the *American Presbyterian*. They are to be found throughout his controversial writings. And they have contributed, in a large degree, to the very unenviable character he now sustains as a controversialist, among Episcopalians, and some other religious denominations. Any one who has read the replies, to which Dr. M. refers, must, I think, admit this imputation of personalities on the part of their authors, to be totally unfounded. They are not now in the way, Dr. M. well knows, to vindicate themselves. But, even if their replies may be thought by some to be at all subject to Dr. M's. imputation, a very brief examination of Dr. M's. *Letters* would, doubtless, satisfy them that there was much provocation on his part. Dr. M. himself cannot deny that in his own *Letters* he indulged in the utmost severity of personal remark.*

Although Dr. Miller declared in the *Continuation of his Letters*, that is, in the *second* volume which he published in the controversy, that he would engage in it no more, yet he renewed the attack upon Episcopacy and Episcopalians in different forms, at several subsequent periods, and down even to the present time. In nearly every work he has published since that period, he has contrived to make manifest in some way, his enduring animosity to Episcopacy. In 1830 he published a second edition of his *Letters on the Ministry*, accompanied by a preface, in which he re-affirmed, with much additional matter directly offensive to Episcopalians, all that he had previously written; and now, more recently, he has repeated it in the *Tract*, which was reprinted in the *American Presbyterian*.

In justification of the publication of this *Tract*, he says, that the request of those for whom he prepared it, was

*See Hobart's Apology, Letter V, and How's Vindication, Letter VI, for a full refutation of this charge of aggression.

founded on "the known fact, that pamphlet after pamphlet was sent forth almost every week from the Episcopal camp intended to show the invalidity of Presbyterian ordination and ordinances, and to recommend all the peculiarities of the Episcopal church, as alone supported by Scripture." That numerous publications have been issued, in defence and explanation of the principles of Episcopacy, is certainly the fact; and this constitutes the gist of this complaint. The intention, which he imputes as their origin, is obviously a mere conceit of his own, arising from the morbid condition of his feelings upon the subject. That Episcopalians should undertake to advocate Episcopacy has always been a sin in his eyes. What pamphlets or books, in particular, he alludes to, it is impossible for me to say; but he well knows that while very few, if any of them, assail Presbyterianism, yet those, on his own side, and they have not been a few, do, in almost every instance, directly assail Episcopacy and Episcopalians.

Let Dr. Miller read again his Life of Dr. Rogers—his Letter to a gentleman in Baltimore, on the case of the Rev. Mr. Duncan—his Essay on the office of Ruling Elder—or his Letters to Presbyterians*—in reference to which works, it might reasonably be asked, what ground there could be for making them the vehicles of assault upon Episcopalians, or Episcopacy. Let him recollect the terms of reproach

*I make the following extract from p. 300, of the last named work, as a sufficient specimen of the whole: "When a Presbyterian ventures into a Protestant Episcopal place of worship, he may *sometimes*, indeed, hear nothing offensive; but *much more generally* he will find himself revolted by claims of being the only true church; by the *most extravagant* praises of their Liturgy and prescribed forms; and by intimations that all who are out of the Episcopal pale are to be regarded as not churches of Christ at all, and as out of the covenanted way of salvation!" *Credat Judæus Apella!*

upon Episcopalians which he has compressed into his preface to the second edition of his *Letters on the Ministry*—let him notice the offensive expressions of his recent *Tract*—let him call to mind the language on this subject, which he has for years accustomed himself to use, in the high places of the General Assembly—to his classes in the Seminary—and in his general intercourse with society, and there will be proof enough of efforts, directly and strongly made, to *put down* Episcopacy.

The examination of the publications referred to, will convince any intelligent and impartial reader, that I am fully justified in imputing to Dr. Miller the feeling towards Episcopacy which the Romans entertained against Carthage—that his animosity against Episcopacy is both inveterate and enduring. When *Dr. Rice*, of Virginia, declared, that “by the help of God, he would wage a warfare against Episcopacy while his life should last,” he did not give stronger evidence of his animosity, than Dr. Miller has by his repeated denunciations and proscriptions. It has been said, however, and perhaps with some truth, that his recent *Tract* would not, probably, have seen the light, had it not been for the immediately precedent erection of an Episcopal church almost under the eyes of the Seminary in which Dr. M. is a professor; where other principles, more agreeable to his mind, were supposed but a short time since to have had perpetual and exclusive possession.*

*I do not, at this time, recollect a single passage of any Episcopal writer, in this controversy, which can be construed, by any effort, to mean any thing more disadvantageous to Presbyterians, than a remark of Dr. Miller’s substantially repeated times without number, in his publications, is to Episcopalians, that “the doctrine, order, and worship of the Presbyterian church are solidly founded in scripture, and the purest christian antiquity, and that *all departures from them are unauthorized innovations.*” I repeat, that I

But, as I have stated above, it was not of the original publication of his Tract that I have complained in my *Letter to the Editors of the American Presbyterian*. In this remote region, far distant from the place of its origin, and equally so, in a good degree from the active discussion of the questions it involves; occupied with employments quite sufficient for any powers which I may possess; I might and should have contentedly left to the pens of my brethren of the East, to give it such notice as they might suppose it to require. That nothing has yet appeared in that region in reply to it, where, according to Dr. M. "for a page of this character from a Presbyterian pen, at least five hundred have appeared from his Episcopal neighbours," is perhaps

do not recollect any passage of *any* Episcopal writer which carries the principle of exclusiveness farther than this. Yet for Episcopalians to pretend to say as much as this on behalf of Episcopacy, Dr. Miller has ever considered to be a grievous sin, never to be forgiven—he represents it as "a violent attack on non Episcopal churches"—as "representing such churches as institutions founded in rebellion and schism, and all who are in communion with such churches, aliens from Christ, out of the appointed road to heaven, having no interest in the promises of God, and no hope but in his uncovenanted mercy, which may be extended to them in common with the serious and conscientious heathen." So too, the Editors of the *American Presbyterian*, quite indifferent, it would seem, whom the slander might wound, or how far the great enemy of souls might derive benefit to his cause by such unfounded reproaches, could deliberately tell their readers that "the clergy of the Episcopal church would unchurch other denominations, and deny them the honor and consolation of being an integral part of the christian church." The assertion has been shown to them to be unfounded, but they have not had the right feeling to retract it, and their 1200 subscribers, and more than 1200 readers are allowed, on their authority, to believe it to be true. I certainly do not envy them any satisfaction, which they, as professing christians, looking forward to the last great account, may derive from such a course of conduct.

proof sufficient, that Dr. Miller's controversial character and habits are too well known to call for any particular attention at this late day. What I complained of was the uncalled for republication of this offensive controversial Tract, by the Editors of the American Presbyterian, in a community which was at peace upon the subject; thereby applying all the obnoxious imputations it contained to the Episcopalians of this city and region.

After all this, Dr. Miller really has the confidence to say, that he has never published a sentence in anywise respecting the Episcopal denomination, but what was drawn from him by repeated previous assaults on her part, and in the purest selfdefence. What does he mean, then, by his recent admission that his object in his *Letters on the Ministry* was *to show his Episcopal brethren that their claims were unfounded?* Was this pure selfdefence? Was it in pure selfdefence that he urged those to whom he addressed his *Letters on the Ministry* in allusion to Episcopalians, to *bear with bigots*—to regard hightoned Episcopalians in the same light with those who “*consistently believe that transubstantiation is a doctrine of Scripture; that the Pope is infallible; that images are a great help to devotion; and that there is no salvation out of the church of Rome?*” Was it in pure selfdefence that he described the religious doctrines held by Episcopalians generally, “*as nearly if not quite as likely to land the believer in the abyss of the damned as in the paradise of God?*” Or, more recently, as “*leading to blank and cheerless Atheism?*” Was it necessary in pure selfdefence, (as he does in all his publications on the subject) to carry the war into the Episcopal camp? And if so, does it not show that my assertion was well founded, that in Dr. M's. belief, the destruction of Episcopacy is needful to the establishment of his own system? Is it indeed necessary, in order to show that the claims of his own church are just,

that he should first prove that the claims of his Episcopal brethren are unfounded? The fact is, that Dr. M. holds conversely the identical proposition of the Episcopalian; and he seems perfectly sensible, and through his whole controversial life has acted strenuously upon the principle, that his own system could not be well founded while Episcopacy was allowed to stand. Hence it is, that what he calls pure selfdefence, has been, in truth, direct assault—that his efforts have been invariably directed to pull down and destroy—that the whole force of his arm, the whole power of his intellectual battery have been used to that end; and though he may have conceived all this to be but pure selfdefence, probably no other man in the country, acquainted with the subject, has been so deceived as himself.

A remarkable instance of the manner in which Dr. Miller allows himself to conduct his controversy, is shown in the following paragraph: “What, he says, would be thought of *a ruffian* who would, without the least provocation, assail with personal violence a neighbor of the most unexceptionable character and deportment, and when that neighbour resented and repelled his violence, should say, why did you attack me.” Apart from the fact that this is a mere begging of the question, so far as reasoning is concerned, yet it is obvious that his opponent, perhaps myself, is here compared to *a ruffian*, and Dr. Miller is himself the “gentleman of the most unexceptionable character and deportment!” His opponent, too, is farther described as “a compound of meanness, insolence and falsehood!” No comment, surely, can be necessary here, further than to ask, with what propriety such a writer can complain of *indecorum* on the part of his opponents!

Lest, however, Dr. M's. gross misrepresentations of the principles of Episcopalianism, in the opening of his communication, should not have made an impression sufficiently

strong, he repeats it at the close of his remarks on the origin and causes of this controversy. I repeat that this representation is untrue; and I must either believe him, notwithstanding all he has written on the subject, to be yet very ignorant of our opinions, or else that he wilfully misrepresents them. I again repeat, and every one at all acquainted with the subject will confirm my statement, that the doctrine of the Episcopal church is identically the same, on this subject, with the 4th art. of the xxvii. chap. of the *Presbyterian Confession of Faith*, as is stated on page 9 I repeat, that any view of our doctrine which makes it more exclusive than is there stated, is unwarranted by the Episcopal church, whatever opinions any individuals may be shown, or supposed, to have held. The position of Episcopalians towards Presbyterians is, in fact, literally the same with that of the Presbyterians themselves towards the Cumberland Presbyterians.

No stretch of credulity will enable us to credit Dr. M's. assertion—which was doubtless written *ad captandum*—that he “yet loves and honors Episcopalians as brethren in Christ, and is ever ready to treat them as such!” Dr. M's conduct towards our church has been hitherto that of unrelenting hostility, without the slightest indication of even a desire for peace. It is too late in the day to palm such language as this upon us. It is, however, even yet more surprising, that *after* the publication of his *Tract on Presbyterianism*; nay, after the gross misrepresentations of the principles of Episcopalians which I have now been employed in noticing, he should have the confidence to assert that “even in respect to those points in which he cannot concur with Episcopalians he condemns them not: but simply assigns the reasons why he is constrained to deviate from their practice;” an assertion plainly contradicted by almost every line he has written on the subject in the last quarter of a century. And he

claims to have had injustice done to his motives by me, when I charge him with a hostility, enduring and unvarying, evidenced by his own admissions, to the church to which I belong! He claims the sympathy of the community against me, for daring to repel his unmeasured imputations and misrepresentations! If his account of our opinions and conduct be true, we are, plainly, little better than the ruffians he intimates us to be; and for repelling such assaults,—for claiming to be understood in our true character,—for being unwilling to be cast out and trodden under foot of men, we are to be spoken of as “a compound of insolence, and falsehood, and meanness!”

Severely has Dr. M. tried our patience, and difficult is it to restrain ourselves from speaking of his conduct as every impartial man will admit that it deserves.

But this topic has already engrossed too much of your attention. Let us pass to his *second* point, which is in relation to his treatment of the *epistles of Ignatius*.

II. The second point to which Dr. Miller directs the attention of his readers, is one which he is reasonably anxious to exhibit in a light more favorable to himself, than that in which it appears in my *Letter to the Editors of the American Presbyterian*. He has been often accused “of deliberately pronouncing opposite judgments concerning the same writer, as it happened to serve *his purpose*.” The charge was repeated in the *Letter to the American Presbyterian*, accompanied by sufficient evidence, in my judgment, to sustain it. Since that time I have had access to other writings of Dr. M. then not in my possession, and I am now, therefore, able to present a still stronger view of Dr. Miller’s variations of opinion or expression, in regard to the *Epistles of Ignatius*.

The following are faithful extracts from his *Letters on the Ministry*, first published in 1807, and reprinted about five years since, with the same expression unaltered—his *Letters*

on *Unitarianism*, published in 1821—and his *Essay on the office of Lay Elder*, published in 1832.

1807.	1821.	1832.
That even the shorter Epistles of Ignatius are unworthy of confidence as the genuine works of the father whose name they bear, is the opinion of some of the ablest and best judges of the Protestant world.	The author is aware that the authenticity of the Epistles of Ignatius has been called in question.— <i>It is sufficient for his purpose</i> to say, that the great body of learned men consider the smaller Epistles of Ignatius, as in the main the real works of the writer whose name they bear.	Intelligent readers are no doubt aware that the genuineness of the Epistles of Ignatius has been called in question by a great majority of the Protestant divines, and is not only really but deeply questionable.

I now deliberately ask you whether an intelligent reader can at all reconcile these discordant opinions? A short solution of the difficulty is, that in the first and last instances he was arguing against Episcopalians, while the almost unanimous voice of the christian world has been, that, if the Epistles of Ignatius are genuine, they bear unequivocal testimony to Episcopacy beyond all power of evasion. In his controversy with us, therefore, they are a mountain in his way which must be uprooted but cannot be passed. In the other instance, they bear an equally unequivocal testimony against Unitarians, and are an equally impassable barrier to them. In the first case *it is sufficient for his purpose* to deny—in the next to admit—and then again to deny, their genuineness. Notwithstanding his attempt to explain these discrepancies, the solution I have given, is, as I verily believe, the only one which can be made capable of satisfying any honest enquirer.

It is to be remarked that in his late Tract on Presbyterianism, he does not call in question the authority of Ignatius, in any sense; but sensible, without doubt, from his past experience, that the testimony of Ignatius, as a witness to a

matter of fact, cannot now be effectually questioned, he exhibits his utmost ingenuity in striving to make him a witness for Presbyterianism; though, even in this effort, any one acquainted with the controversy will easily perceive, that in the way Dr. M. presents the testimony of Ignatius, it is in fact much more on the side of independency or congregationalism, than of his own church. Yet Dr. M. says in the *American Presbyterian*, that, when he quotes Ignatius in that tract *as authority*, he is not “at all inconsistent with the judgment expressed in either of the foregoing publications!”

But Dr. M. contends, that, notwithstanding these occasional denials of the competency of the testimony of Ignatius, he had a right to quote him *against Episcopalians*, as such. For, he asks:

“Do not Episcopalians regard him as both a genuine and authentic witness? Was it not perfectly fair to adduce his testimony to *them*, upon the principle of the *argumentum od hominem*? Is this writer incapable of understanding the principle, that a writer in whom *I* have no confidence, may be fairly quoted by me in controversy with those who profess to have entire confidence in him? Surely your correspondent *is too ignorant* to undertake to discuss a subject of this kind.”

Of my *ignorance*—which he repeatedly imputes to me,—I shall leave others to judge. I have not, however, *denied* his right to quote Ignatius against Episcopacy, unless he may so construe my language when I say (page 20) that Dr. M. “has the rashness to quote *Ignatius*,—that identical father, whose writings are genuine, or not genuine—worthy or not worthy of confidence, according as he may be to serve *the purpose* to which Dr. M. chooses to apply him.” If Dr. M. can, by any fair means, produce passages from the shorter Epistles of Ignatius adverse to Episcopacy, it is undeniably proper that he should do so; and Episcopalians,—allowing, in common with almost every distinguished scholar who has exam-

ined the question, as will be shown, the integrity of these Epistles,—and claiming, as they do, that they bear strong and powerful testimony to their principles,—must submit to have their testimony turned against Episcopacy whenever an adversary shall be found capable of doing it. But that Dr. M. has not such capacity,—that the Epistles themselves cannot be so interpreted,—no candid enquirer needs to be informed.

Let us, however, try Dr. Miller by the rule which he thus broadly lays down. He has a right, even when denying the integrity of the Epistles of Ignatius, to turn their testimony, if he can, against Episcopacy. In his *Letters on Unitarianism*, he makes free use of quotations from these same Epistles. In the *text* where this testimony is cited, there is nothing to imply that he did not think himself quoting a writer of unquestioned authenticity. All that he says, admitting a different construction, is in a brief note at the foot of page 122, which I have quoted above, and which any one may perceive could not have been intended to cast any very deep shade of doubt, over the very important testimony with which he had been furnished by those Epistles. Nay, he even says, (page 124,) of *Ignatius*, and others whom he had previously quoted: “*All the witnesses [Ignatius included] whom I have quoted, lived in the first century, and were personally acquainted with some of the Apostles. Their testimony, therefore, is weighty, and worthy of peculiar attention.*” I am not about to dispute that Dr. M. is right in this view of the testimony of the apostolic fathers, including Ignatius, but I ask, whether Dr. M. could have been ignorant of the fact, that Unitarians have, very generally, *denied* the genuineness of the Epistles of Ignatius, not, like himself, for the support which they give to Episcopacy, merely; but because they also powerfully sustain the doctrine of the Trinity, for which, in his *Letters on Unitarianism*, he quotes them. Did he—who

professes to be a master in Israel, and contemptuously imputes to me *ignorance* of the matter in controversy, *not know* that *Lardner* says that "even the smaller Epistles of Ignatius *may* have been tampered with by the Arians, or Orthodox, or both," and that, of course, on the very points at issue between Dr. M. and the Unitarians? Did he *not know*, that *Priestley*, in his controversy with Horsley, labored hard to disprove the credibility of those Epistles, on this very point; asserting, almost in Dr. M's. own language when arguing against Episcopacy, that "their genuineness is not only very much doubted, but generally given up by the learned"? Or, if he did know this, by what rule of logic does he profess to quote Ignatius against them, as testimony weighty and worthy of peculiar attention? Dr. Miller has surely placed himself in a very strange dilemma. Episcopalians admit the authenticity of the shorter Epistles of Ignatius, and therefore while Dr. M. denies that authenticity, he may nevertheless, quote them against Episcopacy. But both Dr. M. (supposing him to be in the slightest degree consistent,) and Unitarians *deny* their genuineness, and yet he quotes them against Unitarians as testimony *weighty and worthy of peculiar attention!* Who can doubt, that, in truth, Dr. M. *denies* their authenticity, when, as in the case of Episcopacy, their testimony is plainly against him; and *admits* their genuineness when he can use their testimony against others. He may say, it is true, that he, and *some* others, believe the testimony which these Epistles bear to the existence of Episcopacy in the first century, to be interpolated, and that their testimony to the doctrine of the Trinity is genuine; but the Unitarian meets him with the assertion, that they were tampered with by the Orthodox and the Arians against each other, and therefore are of no authority against Unitarianism! He may say that, if all such passages, as he has quoted in favor of the Trinity, be struck out from those Epistles, it would be

impossible to make sense of the remainder; and we say the same of those which go to sustain Episcopacy; remove them, and what is left will be wholly unintelligible. The passages which sustain Episcopacy, and the doctrine of the Trinity, are absolutely necessary to the sense, and if these are struck out as interpolated, the Epistles would serve no purpose to Dr. Miller, or any one else. Let him make the effort.

Dr. Miller is not content with simply charging me with being *too ignorant* to undertake to discuss a subject of this kind, but he also asserts, in the vituperative manner of which every opponent, I believe, without exception, in his numerous controversies has complained, that my *ignorance is profound*. He says, that I discover "*profound ignorance* of the whole state of the case and controversy concerning the Epistles of Ignatius."

I am not able to see that I was called on, either by anything which was contained in his *Tract*, as published in the American Presbyterian; or, in the brief space of a page or two in the hastily prepared *Letter to the Editors of the American Presbyterian*, to exhibit any great show of knowledge on the subject. Neither does such an imputation come with very good grace from one, who is familiarly reported to have quoted for many years from a *mutilated* copy of Ignatius, without being sufficiently acquainted with "the state of the case and controversy" to be aware of the mutilation; or who could express himself in regard to "the state of the case and controversy," with such irreconcilable variety as has been shown above. But let us test *his own* knowledge of this subject more fully. He undertakes to enlighten my ignorance, by informing me that "some of *the most competent judges and writers* of the Episcopal church, confess that the Epistles of Ignatius have been corrupted with respect to the subject of Episcopacy." I certainly admit my ignorance of this fact, and, until he informs us *who* those judges and writers are, must

believe that his ignorance is as profound as my own. I will go farther, and unequivocally deny the truth of his assertion. The *only* writer to whom he refers in support of this opinion, which, if well founded, could be easily sustained, is the author of an *anonymous* communication in the *Christian Observer* for the year 1803. Dr. M's. professed object in this single reference is to enlighten my *profound ignorance*: when, then, in this matter, he brings in the *Christian Observer* as authority, which it certainly well deserves in many respects to be considered, I must ask whether he *did not know* that a translation of the Epistles of Ignatius, had been actually *made for* and published in the previous volume of the same work, and recommended to its readers as the remains of a pious father of the church, and martyr, without any other intimation of doubt in regard to any portion of them, than is contained in the following brief note to the seventh; "the authenticity of all *the superscriptions* may be doubted of, without any injury to the credit of the Epistles themselves"? All the testimony, then, which Dr. M. adduces to sustain his assertion, that "*some of the most competent judges and writers* of the Episcopal church confess that the Epistles of Ignatius have been corrupted on the subject of Episcopacy," is that of a single *anonymous* writer, in a work, whose editors had caused those very Epistles to be translated and published as genuine!

But of what value is the testimony of this anonymous writer in the case? Are we to rely upon his bare opinion, without any proof to sustain it? What facts does he allege to convince us, that "the language of Ignatius on the Episcopal question is, at the earliest, the language of the fourth century"? None whatsoever. Is the language of Ignatius contradicted by any other early writer? Evidence of this, neither is, nor can be adduced. Is it contrary to known facts in the history of that period? It certainly is not. *Gibbon*,

a disinterested witness, tells us plainly that “after we have passed the difficulties of the *first* century, we find Episcopacy every where established;” and the inference which this selfsame anonymous writer in the *Christian Observer* draws from the writings of the other primitive fathers generally, is that “Episcopacy was instituted by the Apostles, and therefore comes from God;” an inference, in my judgment, decidedly against his view of the credibility of the Epistles of Ignatius. No writer who has impugned the veracity of these Epistles has yet attempted to point out distinctly the passages which he supposes to be interpolated; a fact which alone bears with irresistible weight against their opinions. In his late “Tract on Presbyterianism,” written, as he declares in the preface, “solely for the instruction of Presbyterians,” Dr. M. repeatedly quotes Ignatius, without the slightest imputation upon the genuineness of the Epistles; and, of course, allowing his Presbyterian readers to infer, that no such imputation can be made. The passages which he quotes, moreover, are parts of the very same which Episcopalians cite on the subject of the ministry: that identical subject on which, he says above, he has *no* confidence in Ignatius, but which he may quote against Episcopalians who profess to have entire confidence in him.

These remarks bear equally against the opinion of *Neander*, a modern Ecclesiastical historian, of Germany, whom Dr. M. quotes, with evident gratification at the acquisition of what he seems to think a new witness to his cause. It will be time enough to admit its force, when testimony to the actual interpolations is produced. In the meantime, as the knowledge of “the whole state of the case and controversy,” does not involve any vast amount of learning, it will be very easy for any man of a little research, to form an opinion of it, as competently as *Neander*, or any other writer, whom Dr. M. chooses to commend as *learned*, when their opinions are

on his side, or to condemn as *profoundly ignorant* when they happen to differ from him.

The facts in regard to these Epistles are simply these: Ancient writers mention seven Epistles of Ignatious, as written by him, when on the way from Antioch, of which he had been bishop, or prelate, for forty years, to Rome; where he was taken, by order of the Emperor Trajan, to be torn to death by wild beasts. These Epistles are quoted, or referred to by Polycarp, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Jerome, Theodoret, and Gelasius; and others of the fathers. *Le Clerc*, in his *Apostolical Fathers*, and *Pearson* in his *Vindication* of these Epistles, quote testimonies in their favor down to the fourteenth century. There are, at present, two editions of these Epistles extant, which are familiarly called the *larger*, and the *smaller*, or *shorter*. The former were first *printed* in 1498, in an old Latin version, and in 1557 in Greek. The shorter Epistles were first *printed* in a Latin version by Abp. *Usher*, from two MSS, in 1644, and two years later in Greek, from a MS. in the Medicean Library at Florence, by *Vossius*. *Whiston*, an English author, and possibly, as some may think, *Mosheim*, are the only writers, of whom I have heard, who have set up any pretension in favor of the integrity of the *larger* edition. But the quotations in the ancient fathers, are found to correspond perfectly with the *shorter* edition, as well as the Latin and Greek copies with each other. *Usher*, *Vossius*, *Hammond*, *Petavius*, *Grotius*, *Pearson*, *Bull*, *Cave*, *Wake*, *Cotelerius*, *Grabe*, *Dupin*, *Tillemont*, *Le Clerc*, *Fabricius*, *Bochart*, *Jortin*, *Horsley*, *Bowden*, with several of the more learned modern German critics, and others, have asserted, and most of them *vindicated*, the authenticity of the shorter Epistles. *Mosheim* in his *Ecc. Hist.* says: "The *most learned* of men acknowledge these [the shorter Epistles] to be genuine, as they stand in the edition published from a MS. in the Medicean Libra-

ry," by Vossius. *Paley* in his *Evidences of Christianity* says: "What are called the smaller Epistles, *are generally deemed* to be those which were read by Irenæus, Origen, and Eusebius." Even *Lardner* says: that they "are allowed to be genuine by a *great number of learned men*, whose opinion I think to be founded on probable arguments;" and that he will not himself "affirm that there are in them any considerable corruptions or alterations." On the other hand I believe the only Protestant divines, who have called in question the *authenticity* of these Epistles, are Blondel, Daille, Salmasius, Priestley, and in our own country, Dr. Rice and Dr. Miller. *Burton*, in his very learned work on the *Testimonies of the anti-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ*, calls the assertion of Priestley that "the genuineness of the shorter Epistles of Ignatius is not only very much doubted but generally given up by the learned," a "*presumptuous falsehood*,"—a strong but merited expression. And the Editors of the *British Critic* (1827) say: "we strongly suspect, that when Priestley made this *rash assertion* he was unacquainted with the writings of those other great divines, whose names Bishop Horsley furnished for his instruction." In fact, the key to all the opposition with which these Epistles have met, is to be found in the following assertion of Mosheim: "Those who wish to have the Epistles of Ignatius rejected, are principally incited to this desire, by the frequent occurrence in these Epistles, of exhortations to obey the *bishops*, to honor the *presbyters*, and to remain in communion with *both*:" in other words—the testimony which they bear to Episcopacy.

Dr. M. asserts that my charge against him of varying in his opinions on the subject of the authenticity of Ignatius "is much more adapted to disgrace myself than to implicate his veracity." I doubt, whether, after what I have said above, any intelligent reader will agree with him. I did

but quote *his own language*, and left it to the reader of the *Letter* to judge of it. He has, however, thought it necessary to make an attempt to explain his opinions. Let us see how he has succeeded. He says:

“That a little more discernment would have shown him that the inconsistencies between the two statements,* on the face of them, without further explanation, is not so entire and irreconcilable as he seems to suppose. May it not be true that the Shorter Epistles of Ignatius are “deemed unworthy of confidence, as the *genuine* (i. e. unadulterated—free from *spurious admixtures*) works of the author whose name they bear, by *some* of the ablest and best judges of the Protestant world; and yet, at the same time, that *the great body* (i. e. the majority) of learned men consider them as *in the main* (i. e. as to the *great mass of their contents*) as the real work of Ignatius?”

However little may be the *discernment* which he allows to me, he is obliged tacitly to admit, that there is *inconsistency*, though he thinks not *entire and irreconcilable*, between the two opinions I had quoted from his writings in relation to Ignatius. His inuendoes, however, will serve him but little. As the passages stand in connexion with the context—in the sense in which they are used by him in the books from which they are quoted, they *are* discordant, and entirely irreconcilable. In the first case, his object plainly was to *depreciate* the authority of the Ignatian Epistles. In the second, he classes them with testimony *weighty, and worthy of peculiar attention*, and introduces the quotation thus: “The author is aware that the authenticity of the Epistles of Ignatius *has been* called in question. It is sufficient for *his purpose* to say that the great body of learned men consider them,” &c. If there be any way of reconciling these two passages, it is by saying that the *great body* (the majority) of learned men admit, in the main, while

*His opinions on this subject as expressed in 1807 and 1821. See page 22.

some (a few) of the ablest and best judges deny, the authenticity of the Epistles. But, unfortunately for Dr. M., such an explanation of his expressions will only show that he was in doubt on which side to lean, and that he adopted, for the time, that which would be *sufficient* for his immediate *purpose*. But, yet more unfortunately for him, only a few years later, either himself, or his "great majority of the learned," had changed their views, for *then* he was confident that "intelligent readers were aware that the genuineness of these Epistles had been called in question [not by *some*] but by a *great majority* of Protestant divines; and is not only really but deeply *questionable!*" And more unfortunately still, in the last work which came from his pen, to satisfy the members of his own church that "the system by which they are distinguished, is throughout, truly primitive and apostolic," he cites portions of those very passages, on which, if Episcopalians should ask him to point out interpolations, he would place his finger, because they are cited truly and entirely by them on behalf of Episcopacy—he cites portions of those very passages without the expression of the slightest doubt of their authenticity! It is true, he says in his communication to the *American Presbyterian*, that when he so quotes Ignatius in his late *Tract* as authority, "there is nothing at all inconsistent with the judgment expressed by him in either of the foregoing publications," but he is probably the only man living who will think so.

III. The third point in Dr. M's. communication in the *American Presbyterian* is thus stated by him:

"Another charge, which your correspondent alleges with much indignant zeal, and apparent astonishment, is, that I have said, in my *Tract* on Presbyterianism, that Episcopalians not only are not able to find any warrant for their claim in Scripture, but that they do not so much as pretend to find any. And this he alleges I have done in a *Tract* which contains a distinct reference to a little work by an

Episcopal writer, entitled 'Episcopacy tested by Scripture.' The charge is a slander. I have said no such thing as he ascribes to me, in the passage to which he refers; although, for want either of attention or discernment, he, no doubt, so construed the passage. The following is my language: 'When we ask the advocates of Episcopacy whence they derive their favorite doctrine that diocesan bishops succeed the apostles in the appropriate powers and pre-eminence of their apostolic character, they refer us to no passages of scripture, asserting or even hinting it; but to some equivocal suggestions and allusions of several fathers, who wrote within the first four or five hundred years after Christ.'

On this point Dr. M. obviously labored under no small degree of irritation. He accuses me of *gross misrepresentation*—he calls me *a reckless adversary*, &c. and yet, in the *Letter to the Editor of the American Presbyterian*, I only quoted his own language, just as he has quoted it above, as the following extract from page 7th will show:

"You give us an unexceptionable statement of the received doctrine of Episcopacy, and add, 'to no part of this claim;' that is, the claim of Episcopalians that their church constitution is primitive and apostolic; 'does the New Testament afford the least countenance.' You say that Episcopacy is 'a usurpation for which there is not the smallest warrant in the word of God:' that 'there is not the semblance of support to be found in Scripture for the alleged transmission of the pre-eminent and peculiar power of the apostles to a set of ecclesiastical successors: that '*when we ask the advocates of Episcopacy whence they derive their favorite doctrine, that diocesan bishops succeed the apostles in the appropriate powers and pre-eminence of their apostolic character, they refer us to no passages of Scripture asserting or even hinting it:*' that, '*it is not so much as pretended that a passage is to be found, which gives a hint of this kind:*'"

I make, it is true, the following inference from these expressions, and you can judge whether it is, in the smallest particular, unwarranted:

"The plain meaning of these assertions is, that, in the opinion of Dr. Miller, and the editors of the *American Presbyterian*, *Episco-*

paliars not only cannot find any countenance in Scripture for their doctrine of the constitution of the Christian ministry, but they do not even make pretensions to do so."

And I add, on 'a subsequent page:

"But, at the very time that Dr. Miller made his singularly bold declaration, that when the advocates of Episcopacy are asked whence they derive their favorite doctrine, 'they refer us to no passages of Scripture asserting, or even hinting it; but to some equivocal suggestions and allusion of several Fathers, who wrote within the first four or five hundred years after Christ,' he certainly had before him, for he quotes it just before, a little work by Bishop Onderdonk of Pennsylvania; which he could not but know, is extensively approved of among Episcopalians, in this country, with the very title *Episcopacy tested by Scripture.*"

Yet Dr. M. calls my inference a *slander!* He says that he *has said no such thing as I ascribe to him!* This charge surely requires no farther notice from me. Let us pass to the next.

IV. Dr. Miller says:

"Your correspondent further represents me as misquoting Ignatius, and as making a disingenuous use of my quotations from the Father. The same charge was made by Dr. Cooke, of Kentucky, five or six years ago; and though clearly shown, in the Biblical Repertory, in a review of Dr Cooke's work, to be false, it has been since copied and repeated, by almost every Episcopal writer who has been pleased to notice me, from that day to this. The charge however, I again assert, is false—utterly false; and those who have repeated it, have lent themselves to the propagation of slander.

This paragraph certainly does not manifest much of that christian *spirit and conduct* which Dr. M. highly commends at the conclusion of his paper; and contains some evidence that the subject is one on which his mind has become very sensitive. There is some reason for this, perhaps, in the fact, that his great disingenuousness in his quotations from Ignatius, has had a very great influence in depriving him of

that respect, which men of all sorts are generally ready to extend to a fair and reasonable opponent. Dr. M. has certainly long ceased to be regarded as such by Episcopalians throughout the country. This is manifest from his own language in the above extract.

Dr. M. says that this charge, as originally made by Dr. *Cooke* of Kentucky, was clearly shown to be false, in the *Biblical Repertory*. But Dr. M. is a little too hasty in this matter: the charge is, unfortunately, too true to be disproved; and so Dr. *Cooke* showed in his Reply to the *Biblical Repertory*, which is accessible to every reader. But Dr. *Cooke* needs no assistance from me in this matter, and I shall only notice this charge so far as I am concerned. The following is the passage of the *Letter* which has brought this phial of wrath upon my head:

“If Dr. Miller fails of convincing his readers, it will not be for want of bold assertions—bold, beyond those of any other polemic with whom I am acquainted—bold beyond any warrant of testimony, or the previously declared opinions of any other assailant of Episcopacy. He says, ‘It is very certain that the Fathers who flourished nearest the apostolic age, generally represent presbyters and not prelates (bishops) as the successors of apostles,’ and he actually has the rashness to quote *Ignatius*—that identical *father*, whose writings are genuine, or not genuine—worthy, or not worthy of confidence, according as he may be made to serve the purpose to which Dr. Miller chooses to apply him! How little he is able to make use of him in assailing Episcopacy, let the following exhibition of the manner in which his quotations are made, and of *Ignatius*’ own statements show:

Dr. Miller quotes him as saying

The presbyters *succeed* in the place of the bench of the apostles.

The passage truly copied is

I exhort you, that ye study to do all things in a divine concord; your bishops in the place of God; your presbyters in the place of the council of the apostles; and your deacons most dear to me being entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ.—*Ep. to Magnesians.*

AGAIN.

In like manner let all reverence the presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God, and college of the apostles.

In like manner let all reverence the deacons as Jesus Christ; and the bishop as the Father, and the presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God, and college of the apostles; without these there is no Church.—*Ep. to Trallians.*

AGAIN.

Be subject to your presbyters as to the apostles of Jesus Christ our hope.

It is therefore necessary, that as ye do, so without your bishop you should do nothing: also be ye subject to your presbyters, as the apostles of Jesus Christ our hope, in whom if we walk, we shall be found in him. The deacons, also, as being ministers of Jesus Christ, &c.—*Ep. to Trallians*

AGAIN.

Follow the Presbyters as the apostles.

See that ye all follow your bishop as Jesus Christ the Father; and the presbyters as the apostles.—*Ep. to Smyrneans.*

The feeblest capacity can judge of the integrity of these quotations of Dr. Miller. Let it be remembered that his object is to show reasons for *rejecting Episcopacy*; or, as he calls it, prelacy—*rejecting* the belief that *three* orders, (bishops, priests, and deacons,) were established in the christian ministry by the apostles. Was there ever a more unfaithful application of any man's written opinions? Dr. M. omits the *facts* to which Ignatius actually does testify, and changes a high wrought, fanciful, and unreasonable *com-*

parison, which the unbridled zeal of Ignatius led him to make, into an allegation of *facts*; of *such* facts too, as stand *diametrically opposed* to Ignatius' own testimony!"

Yet Dr. M. says: "It is still my deliberate conviction that I gave a *fair specimen* of that testimony from the father in question, which Episcopal writers are accustomed to quote as favoring their cause"!

2. He says, that "a ground of this charge of unfair dealing with Ignatius is, that I allege that he every where represents the *Presbyters*, and not the *Bishops*, as the *successors of the Apostles*. But is it not literally and strictly true that Ignatius *does*, in every instance, make the precise statement which I have alleged? He often speaks of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons; but, so far as I recollect, in all cases in which he speaks of succession at all, he represents the Presbyters as succeeding in the place of the Apostles."

In the parts of sentences which Dr. Miller has quoted from Ignatius in his *Tract*—and it is proper that I should state that the above *four* are *all* which I could find in that part of the *Tract* which treats of church government—it would, most probably, be inferred, by readers generally, that Ignatius did mean to represent presbyters as successors of the apostles; but will any reader say, that such an inference can be drawn from the entire sentences, as presented above? Does Ignatius really represent presbyters as *the successors of the apostles* in any other sense than he represents bishops as successors of God, the Father; and the deacons as the successors of Jesus Christ? Does he, in fact, speak of *succession* at all in those passages? Is not the very language of the first quotation, unwarrantably altered by Dr. M., that it may express that idea?

Dr. M. asks if he has, in these quotations from Ignatius,

“kept back any thing which he ought to have stated?” Undeniably he has. Could he have been ignorant that he was not giving *fair* and *full* quotations from Ignatius, when he has actually quoted the same passages in full, as above given by me, when it suited *his purpose*, in his *Essay on the office of Ruling Elder?* (p. 78–79.)

Dr. M. is, it seems, very thoroughly convinced, that Ignatius “is every where describing *presbyterianism* and not *diocesan episcopacy*, as the form of church government which existed in his day.” He is, indeed, so deeply persuaded, that he has entirely overlooked the absurdity of such a view, though often pressed upon him. It is sufficient to say here, that *common sense* repels the idea, that presbyters could be at the same time successors of the apostles, whose exercise of *the ministry* is unquestioned, and yet be, on Dr. M’s. theory—mere *lay* elders—representatives of the people—not *entitled* to exercise the ministry. that the office of *pastor* should be necessary to the church, and yet have no prototype in the apostolic age. But I refer you to my observations on this point, at p. 36, of the *Letter to the American Presbyterian*, as a conclusive answer, in few words, to all that Dr. M. can allege on this subject.

Dr. M. concludes his fourth charge, with the following very singular statement: “If your correspondent does not understand how the Presbyters or Elders spoken of by Ignatius could have been ‘Ruling Elders,’ on the Presbyterian plan, as most of them, if not all, probably were, (an idea which, it would seem, appears to him unspeakably ridiculous) I can only say that he is not yet competent to discuss the subject on which he has undertaken to instruct the public.” Perhaps my discernment may be at fault, but I can only understand him as declaring here, that, if I cannot adopt *his views*, in relation to Ignatius, I am incompetent to discuss the subject of *Episcopacy*; or, in other words, that

I am incompetent to defend the opinions which I have deliberately and understandingly adopted, against an assailant who is inaccessible to argument—contemptuous to his opponents—unfaithful in his quotations—variable in his own opinions to suit *his purpose*—and intolerant of all opinions but his own!

V. The next point on which Dr. M. dilates is an *incidental* remark in the *Letter &c.* that he uses the term *prelacy*, in reference to the simple form of apostolical Episcopacy, as contended for by us, “in defiance of the usage of all good writers and of all Episcopalians especially.” I laid but little stress on this matter; and it must have required some diligence on his part to hunt it out, amidst much other matter which called for his attention, but which he has thought it expedient to overlook. My allegation, however, was—though it did not suit him so to present it—that “in defiance of the usage of all good writers, and of all Episcopalians especially, he *continually substitutes it for episcopacy.*” He could not, whatever he may say *ad captandum* on the subject, have supposed, that I meant to insinuate that this term is not used occasionally by good writers, especially in reference to certain *modifications* of episcopacy. But he does not give me credit for perceiving, what requires no very strong vision, that he earnestly covets the term Episcopacy for his own church system; and that he has discovered that the fathers and founders of English and American presbyterianism, the Westminster Assembly, made a very great mistake when they, warily as they thought, but unwarily as Dr. M. doubtless thinks, adopted a name, which forever compels their successors to defend their ecclesiastical system apart from the testimony of ecclesiastical history. This is apparent in his laborious struggles to wrest Ignatius as a witness on his own side. He knows, and every one knows, who has read the Epistles of Ignatius, that they testify to a form of *epis-*

episcopacy wholly distinct from the form of *presbytery* as originally established: that he speaks of bishops, priests, and deacons, as orders of *the ministry*, actually exercising its offices; and does not, like the *Westminster Confession* and the *Form of Government* of his own church, term the last two, *representatives of the people* merely. But, in his book on the office of *Lay Elder*, he strives hard, both to bring scriptural and other testimony in favor of that office; and to elevate it by forms of ordination, and by strong descriptions of its importance, dignity, and necessity, into a much nearer alliance with the presbyters of Ignatius, than it has ever yet had. Hence it is that he is now desirous of availing himself of a term consecrated to an invariable sense by ecclesiastical history, and by the uniform usage of ecclesiastical writers. What writer before Dr. Miller ever dignified *parity* with the title of *episcopacy*? Who does not know that the English puritans, of the days of the Westminster Assembly, gloried in the name of *Presbyterian* as opposed to *Episcopal*? And even in the Constitution of the American Presbyterian church, so far from claiming the term *bishop* as indisputably indicative of the *pastoral* office, it is modestly declared that this title "*ought not be rejected.*" Note to ch. IV. But Dr. M. also very well knows, that, while in "its derivation and meaning," the term *prelacy* has the sense of episcopacy, yet a sense has been attached to it, such as he appears to desire should continue with it, conveying odium to the popular mind. He, I am confident, has not forgotten the *Covenant* made in a certain country, "against *popery, prelacy, and superstition*, and to uphold the *gospel*;" nor can he need to be reminded of the definition given to it by the Westminster Assembly, of "church government by archbishops, bishops, deans, and chapters, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy;" or even of the more recent distinction, made by the late commentator *Tho-*

mas Scott, when he said, in one of his letters: "I am an Episcopalian, but not a prelatist." Neither can Dr. M. suppose, that he makes the term more acceptable to us, at his hands, though he calls it *respectful*, when the analogy which he presents, is that of the application of the terms *Papist* and *Socinian*, to bodies which uniformly resent their use. He says, however, that in some form a distinction "ought to be made, and *must* be made in the use of the term Episcopacy;" an assertion which proves yet more strongly, the difficulties which press on his mind, when he reflects, that in its long continued and exclusive application, by writers of every description, to what he calls *the prelatical church*, that church has an advantage, which his own, by the deliberate disavowal of it can never hope to possess.—Dr. M. has no warrant whatever, for applying this term to the Presbyterian system, nor is the word to be found at all in the *Form of Government* of the Presbyterian church.*

Dr. M. drags in, rather awkwardly,—for the sake probably of giving more point to his remarks on this head,—from some querulous puritan, whom he calls, "a venerable old writer," the following classification—"Divine Episcopacy,"—by which, it seems, is meant, not episcopacy, but presbyterianism: "2d. Human episcopacy,"—by which he

*I am sustained, I think, in this view of the subject by Dr. M. himself, when he says: "Our Episcopal brethren are fond of having a title applied to them which would convey the idea that *they alone have Bishops*. Now it is well known that Presbyterians claim to have bishops as well as they. And what is worthy of particular notice, Presbyterians *now* use the title, not to designate *prelates*, but plain pastors of churches." It is believed that there is no instance on record of the European Presbyterian reformers designating their "plain pastors of churches" by this title. Through all ecclesiastical history, from Clement of Rome down to our own times, this term has but one sense—'hat now given to it by Episcopalians, and by most Presbyterian writers also.

means that episcopacy, which the Fathers and ecclesiastical history represent as established by the Apostles: and “3d. Diabolical Episcopacy—referring to the papal system.” Dr. Miller certainly explains the terms according to his *theory*, while I have ventured to conform them to the *facts*. Perhaps he will be willing to take a quotation from another “venerable old writer,” who says, that “some pretended in his day to derive *presbytery* from Jethro, in his humble petition and advice to Moses concerning the government of the Jews. It is well that we see from whence it came, even from Midian, an *heathenish* place, and unacquainted with the true worship of God, then confined only to the Jews,” &c. Suppose that I should apply to Dr. M. his own remark, and ask him whether the expression applied by *this* “venerable old writer” to his system, “would suit him better”?

In relation, however, to the use of the term *Bishop*, I must mention a fact, which, in this connexion, it seems to me, deserves to be recorded. Previously to the American Revolution, the members of the Episcopal church in this country, were obliged to send all their candidates for the ministry to England, for ordination; being prevented by active and persevering efforts on the part of some in this country, and in England, from having resident Bishops. The evil was deeply and strongly felt, as it deprived them of some of their dearest religious privileges. At a period immediately before the Revolution, there was some probability that their repeated petitions, appeals, and remonstrances, would be heard, and that they would be allowed to place themselves on *an equal footing* with other religious denominations. It was expected that one of the bishops who were then to be appointed, would reside at Burlington, on the eastern bank of the Delaware. Such, however, was the feeling excited among the opponents of episcopacy, that threats were openly made in

Philadelphia, that, instead of a Bishop being allowed to reside on the banks of the Delaware, he should actually be put into the river! When, after the revolution, the General Convention of the Episcopal church determined to obtain the Episcopal office, it was seriously proposed to change the name of *Bishop* for one less *odious* to the opponents of episcopacy; and when the present venerable Bishop White returned home, after having been consecrated a *Bishop*, he was earnestly advised, even in the city of Philadelphia, to be cautious how, with his new character, he exposed his person! What a change has he lived to see in this respect! The abhorred name is now coveted on every side! All who pretend to the ministry among the sects of which our country may be said to be fertile, are willing now at least to share with us; and Dr. Miller, it seems, is even desirous to deprive us of a name, which, a generation since, all were equally willing to leave to our exclusive possession; and were equally ready to represent as too odious to be endured!

VI. Dr. M. says that

“AN ‘EPISCOPALIAN’” utterly misconceives and misrepresents the use which I make of Dr. *Barrow*. I never thought of intimating that he was not a believer in the divine right of Prelacy. It never entered in my mind that such a construction would be put upon what I said concerning him, by any human being. It was enough for *my purpose* to cite his opinion and his proof, that the apostles, as such, and in their pre-eminent character, had and could have, no successors. This was my sole object in quoting him. And whatever your correspondent may think of his judgment as bearing on this point, I am confident that no impartial inquirer will fail to feel its force, and admit its conclusiveness.”

Now the truth is, that so far from my misconceiving and misrepresenting Dr. M. it is himself who misconceives and misrepresents both Dr. *Barrow* and myself, as the “impartial inquirer” may easily perceive.

1st. He misconceives and misrepresents Dr. *Barrow*, for

Dr. B. in the very passage which Dr. Miller quotes, when he represents the "*apostolical office*" as "not successive, not communicable to others," means, as he himself states, "that such an office, consisting of so many *extraordinary privileges*, and *miraculous powers*, which were requisite for the foundation of the church, was not designed to continue by derivation, for it contained in it divers things *which apparently were not communicated*, and which *no man*, without gross imposition and hypocrisy, *could challenge to himself*." Now Dr. M. must certainly well know, that Episcopalians have never contended that Bishops were the successors of Apostles in their *extraordinary privileges* and *miraculous powers*, but only in the peculiar and pre-eminent powers of *ordination and government*. He ought to know, also, that Dr. Barrow cannot be understood to mean, that the Apostles had no successors in these two "peculiar and pre-eminent" parts of their office. If, therefore, he understands Dr. B. in the quotation he makes from him, as denying that Bishops are the successors of the Apostles, except in their extraordinary privileges and miraculous powers, he certainly *misconceives* him; and when he represents, as he plainly does in his *Tract*, "the judgment of this able and learned prelatist, concerning the foundation of the whole argument" of Episcopalians, as opposed to their doctrine that Bishops succeeded the Apostles in the peculiar and pre-eminent powers of ordination and government, he certainly very grossly *misrepresents* him. Dr. Barrow unquestionably maintains this doctrine; and any Episcopalian may very safely subscribe to the sentiments in Dr. M's. quotation, when viewed apart from the statements with which Dr. M. has introduced it in his *Tract*.

2d. But Dr. M. misconceives and misrepresents me also. He says, "I never thought of intimating that Dr. Barrow was not a believer in the divine right of prelacy. It never entered my mind that such a construction would be put upon

what I said concerning him, by any human being." It is sufficient in reply to say, that I did not charge him with denying that Dr. B. did not believe in *the divine right of prelacy*. My language was: "Dr. M. quotes a passage from Dr. Barrow for the purpose of showing that Dr. B. did not consider the Apostles as having *any regular successors*:—Dr. M. seems to have intended that his readers should infer that Dr. Barrow did not himself believe in *the apostolic origin* of Episcopacy." If Dr. M., when he represents Dr. B. as denying that the Apostles had successors in their pre-eminent and peculiar powers, meant merely to show, that "as men endowed with the gifts of miracles and inspiration, who were, prior to the completion of the canon of the New Testament, constituted the infallible guides of the church, they had no successors;" as Episcopalians participate with him in this opinion, there was no reason for his quoting Dr. B., or any one else; but his evident *purpose* was, to represent Dr. B. as opposed to the Episcopal view of apostolic succession;—he evidently designed that his reader should so understand it; and I have of course neither misconceived nor misrepresented him.

VII. We come now to the case of the Waldenses. Dr. M. says that I "still insist that the Waldenses had episcopacy established among them." He adds: "It really surprises me that after the testimony which has been adduced, that point should be any longer questioned." Wonderful indeed, that any one should presume to question what Dr. M. chooses to think settled! But where, let me ask, is this testimony adduced? Is it by Dr. M. himself, in his *Letters on the Ministry*? Surely that had received a sufficient refutation, for any mind open to conviction, by Dr. Bowden, long since. At any rate, Dr. Bowden quoted competent authorities against Dr. M. of whom he *now* takes no notice. In my *Letter to the American Presbyterian*, I quoted in favor of

the episcopal character of the ancient Waldensian church, *Mosheim*; *Peyrani*, one of their own writers; the London *Christian Observer*, the same work which Dr. M. refers to in what he says of *Ignatius*; and the late Rev. *Dr. Wilson*, a Presbyterian clergyman, of great talent, industry, and research, formerly of Philadelphia. As only one of these writers, (the *Observer*) was *Episcopal*, I supposed I had quoted learned, impartial, and competent authorities. Dr. M. says, that he considers the witnesses he has adduced, "as better authority than any which I have arrayed against them." I propose therefore briefly to examine this subject.

It is necessary to state, in the first place, that in the year 1630, the vallies of Piedmont, where the Waldenses dwell, and from which they derive their name, were visited by a plague, which swept off a large proportion of the people, and all their ministers, with the exception of two who had retired from the work, in extreme age. At this period, they obtained an immediate supply of *Presbyterian* ministers from France and Switzerland, who belonged to the Calvinistic church. It is distinctly *admitted*, that, subsequently to that period, the form of the ministry among them has been Presbyterian. But that it was so previously to this period, and through the most important part of their history as a church, is as distinctly *denied*. From that period upwards, to the time of Pope Sylvester, and the Emperor Constantine the Great, as far as they can trace their history, their ministry was *Episcopal*.* Dr. Miller wholly overlooks this distinction; and finding that all accounts agree

*The only historian of the Waldenses *prior* to this period was Perrin, pastor of a church at Lyons, in France. As the subject before us was not a disputed one in his day, his work contains no precise information in regard to it.

that their ministry is now, and through its modern portion substantially Presbyterian, he infers that it has always been so, and will meddle with no testimony which cannot, in some way, be made to sustain his views. For this reason the learning of such men as *Usher*, *Allix*, *Peyrani*, *Mosheim* and *Sims*, has been arrayed before him to no purpose.

I propose to present such testimony as I have been able to collect from the few works within my reach, to the episcopal character of the Waldenses, and then to examine the weight of the opposing testimonies on which Dr. Miller relies for denying that character to them.

1st. The earliest writers, in relation to the Waldenses, were Roman Catholics, and consequently their enemies. Their testimony on the point before us varies much. *Usher*, in his work on the succession of the Western churches, has collected and compared their conflicting assertions, and has shown that, according to one, they permit laymen to consecrate the elements; according to another, consecration is the work of the priesthood; of which according to another, there were actually *three orders*. *Bresse*, one of their own historians, says in his History, that Pope Eneas Sylvius said of the Waldenses, that one of their doctrines was that "the Bishop of Rome, is not superior to *other Bishops*." *Jones*, an English anti-episcopal writer, professedly quoting the same work of Eneas Sylvius, represents him as alleging, that the Waldenses held "that the Pope of Rome is not superior to *Bishops*, and that there is no difference among *priests*."

Bresse, in his History above quoted, in the chapter on the *Discipline of the Vaudois church*, distinctly marks the change which occurred at the period above named. He says: "The public worship was always celebrated in the Vaudois language, till 1630, when a pestilence swept off the whole of the barbes (pastors) with the exception of two, who were

inefficient from age. In consequence, pastors were invited to come from France and Geneva.—In the holy sacraments, the bread was, until 1630, broken into three parts, and the water thrice sprinkled in baptism, in remembrance of the Trinity. The parishioners, without exception, assembled at the house of their respective *elders*, [see quotation from Mosheim below] for communion, which was celebrated four times a year; when before Easter, and sometimes before Christmas, each person was required by his pastor to give his reasons for his faith.—Before the time of the plague, the *pastors* were subject each year, to a visit from the *moderator*, and two members of the Synod, who, after minute enquiries, made their report to the Synod. The foreign clergy would not submit to this ordinance.” Any one acquainted with ecclesiastical history, must, I think, perceive that he speaks here of an Episcopal jurisdiction, though he uses the term *oderator*, consistently perhaps, with the modern ideas of the Waldenses; and that such jurisdiction was disallowed by the French and Swiss Presbyterian ministers, when they took the charge of the Waldensian churches.

Mosheim, referring to Perrin, Leger, Usher, and Basnage, says, that “the government of the church was committed by them to *Bishops*—who were also called *majorales* or *elders*—presbyters, and deacons; and that they acknowledged that these three ecclesiastical orders were instituted by Christ himself.”

In an apology for their faith, presented to Francis I. of France, (1554) from the Waldensian church, it is said that *Bishops and pastors* ought to be irreprehensible in their manners.”

The late moderator *Peyrani*, of a family distinguished through a long period of Waldensian history; himself a man of unquestioned talent and erudition; and undeniably better acquainted with their history, than any other man of modern

times, on being asked by Mr. *Gilly*, whether there had not formerly been bishops, properly so called, in the Vaudois church, expressly answered, *yes*.—In a communication, made by him to the London Society for propagating the Gospel, in 1820, he expressed his “regret at the misfortunes which had *deprived* the Waldensian church of the benefit of episcopal government.”—In his second Letter to Cardinal *Pacca*, contained in his *Historical Defence of the Waldenses*, he says, that *Peter Waldo* admitted the three orders of *Bishops, priests and deacons*.”

Dr. Miller admits that the Bohemian *protestants* were a branch of the Waldenses. He represents their historian, *Comenius*, as saying, that “there were certain *seniors*, who performed certain duties for the sake of order, but claimed no superiority, by divine right.” It is true, he does not give this as an actual quotation from *Comenius*; but the inference he wishes drawn, if the remark has any bearing on the subject before us, is, that the Bohemians were *not episcopal*; yet he had certainly seen the following passages which are directly opposed to his theory. *Comenius* says in his History: “The protestants of Bohemia, who were apprehensive that ordinations, in which *presbyters*, and not a Bishop, should create another presbyter, would not be lawful; and were in doubt how they should be able to maintain such an ordination, either to others whom they opposed, or to their own people when they questioned it—sent deputies to the remains of the ancient *Waldenses*, by whose *Bishops* these deputies were consecrated to the *episcopal* office, which they have ever since transmitted to their successors.” Certainly, this is a very different view of the case from that presented by Dr. Miller. The same fact is stated in the *Bohemian Book of Order and Discipline*: “Whereas, the said *Waldenses*, affirming that they have lawful *Bishops* and a *lawful uninterrupted secession from the Apostles* to the present

day, did solemnly create three of our ministers Bishops, and confer on them power to ordain ministers." These Bishops, so ordained, did not, however take that name, but were called *Seniors*, or superintendants; and from this trivial circumstance, in opposition to the fact of their receiving a new ordination, when already *priests*, Dr. M. would have his readers infer that they were not Bishops *in fact*. But *Comenius* gives us a reason for this. He says: "They did not take upon them the name of *Bishop*, on account of the anti-christian abuse of that name," by the papal bishops around them; just as it was proposed, as I have stated above, in our own General Convention, that the American Bishops should have a different title because of the odium then thought to be attached to that of Bishop; or just as *some* of the Bishops of Denmark and Sweden, have, since the Reformation, borne the name of *superintendants*, while all the rest are called *Bishops*. Surely Dr. M. should be cautious how *he* accuses others of *incompetency* to discuss the subject of Episcopacy!

But again: *Crantz* in his *Ancient History of the Moravian Brethren* says: "The *Waldenses* traced the succession of their *Bishops from the Apostles' times*. The Bohemians sent three of their priests, *already ordained*, to Stephen, Bishop of the *Waldenses*, who consecrated them, with the assistance of his co-bishop, to be Bishops of the *Brethren's church*."—And again: In the *Compendium of the History of the Brethren's church*, written by one of their Bishops, and translated by La Trobe, it is said that "the *Vallences* traced their doctrines, and the succession of their Bishops, from the *Apostles*, and the primitive christians." And yet again: "A persecution arose against the *Waldenses* in Austria, by which they were totally dispersed, and their *Bishop Stephen*, was burnt at Vienna. Thus the wonderful providence of God spared this last Bishop of the *Waldenses*, un-

til he transmitted *regular episcopal ordination* to the Brethren." *Crantz* names 67 Bishops of the Moravian Brethren from 1735 back to Stephen, Bishop of the Waldenses in 1497.

Dr. *Jablowsky*, chaplain to the King of Prussia, in the beginning of the last century, and a Senior or Bishop of the Bohemian church in Poland, in a letter printed in the second volume of the *Life of Archbishop Sharp*,* after asserting the existence of episcopacy in the christian church for 1500 years, "in all ages and times, down from the Apostles, and in all places where there were christians," adds: "before the great Reformation, when the followers of Huss in Bohemia separated themselves from the Romish church, they made it one of their first cares to preserve *an episcopal succession* for their little church, and that by the means of *some Bishops of the Vaudois*, at that time there in exile, which happened in 1497."

But the writer, who, until recently at least, has examined the most thoroughly into this question, was Dr. *Allix*, of whom *Jones*, in his *History of the Waldenses*, has said, "that his researches into the history of the Waldensian churches entitle him to the gratitude of posterity." Dr. Miller has certainly reason to know something of this writer, but he has carefully abstained from any reference to him. Now,

*The author of this work says of the Protestant (Bohemian) church in Poland: "Under the title of *Seniors* that church has kept up a character very much resembling our (English) Bishops. These Seniors received a *second* ordination or consecration to their office, and none can be received into the ministry but by the imposition of their hands." This Dr. *Jablowsky* is the same Bishop who conveyed the episcopal succession to the Bohemian brethren, who fled from Moravia to Hernhutt, from which the United Brethren, or Moravians, of this country derive their ministry. There are now several Moravian Bishops in America. No one can question the lawfulness of their episcopacy.

Dr. Allix asserts positively, that the Waldenses distinguished their clergy into *three* orders, Bishops, priests, and deacons. And he produces numerous unquestionable proofs of this assertion. The following will suffice here. He quotes an ancient writer as saying, that "they hold that no other orders ought to be retained in the church, but those of priests, deacons, and Bishops:" a passage evidently written against the Roman Catholic pretensions.

Sleidan, in his *History of the Reformation*, says, that the Bohemian people were divided into three classes, or sects. Of the third sect, (or Waldenses,) he says that they admitted nothing but the Bible, as the ground of their doctrine, and that they chose their own *priests and bishops*.

The *Christian Observer*, 1815, page 65, in noticing Sims' Memoir of the Waldenses, says, expressly: "The ancient Waldenses were *Episcopalians*." In the same work for 1828, page 254, in a review of several authors on the Waldenses, it is said: "Some modern publications have claimed the authority of the Waldenses, as far as that is of weight in controversy, as unfavorable to episcopacy; but we conceive the fact is far otherwise. The subject is discussed at some length by Mr. *Sims*, the editor of *Peyran*. The proofs he adduces of there having been the *three* orders of Bishops, priests, and deacons, amongst the ancient Vaudois, are ample and conclusive. *Peyran* asserts in his second letter to cardinal *Pacca*, that Peter Waldo of Lyons admitted these *three* orders. From the Lyonese branch of the Waldenses, many of whom together with Waldo, settled finally in Bohemia, the United Brethren, received episcopacy into their infant church. In the year 1715, a branch of this church, in Great Poland and Polish Russia, was recommended for relief to the British government, by Archbishop *Wake*, after an inquiry into its episcopal character, and its present and former state, in a correspondence between that prelate and

Dr. *Jablowsky*. At a later period Archbishop *Potter* expressly stated, respecting the Hernhutt branch of the Bohemian and Moravian brethren, that "no Englishman who had any notion of ecclesiastical history could doubt of their episcopal succession."

The Dublin *Christian Examiner*, vol. iv. p. 355, in giving an account of Abp. *Usher's* collection of Waldensian MSS. deposited in the Library of Trinity College in that city, says; "The Episcopal Reformed church is eminently bound to assist the Waldenses, not only the witnesses of the truth of the doctrines which we hold in common with other protestants, but they are evidences of the high antiquity of our form of church government, which they claim to have been transmitted to them from the apostolic times." Again: the same work, conducted with unquestioned talent and learning, in a review of Gilly's *Excursion to Piedmont*, vol. 1. p. 527, says, "The episcopal succession and character were retained in acknowledged purity for centuries after the establishment of the Vaudois church, as independent of Rome."

The *British Critic*, 1826, p. 386, says, "the Vaudois church was actually episcopal till the distresses of the times, augmented by a dreadful pestilence, in the early part of the seventeenth century, threw them into the arms of Switzerland."

The late Rev. Dr. *Wilson*, an eminent Presbyterian divine, of Philadelphia, whose talents and learning need no commendation from any one, and who evidently had patiently examined this question, says of the Waldenses, that they "were covertly *episcopal*, though after Claude (of Turin) not papal; but *never presbyterial* prior to the Helvetic abjuration of popery."

And, lastly, I think I may adduce here a reluctant and awkward testimony from Dr. Miller himself. In his *Essay*

on the office of Lay Elder, speaking of the Bohemian branch of the Waldenses, he distinctly admits that those churches had some features in their system of church order, which were *not* strictly *Presbyterian*: "That those churches gave the title of *Seniors*, but more frequently of *Antistites* to certain elderly clergymen, who were peculiarly venerable in their character, and who chiefly took the lead *in all ordinations*, is, no doubt true."—When this statement is compared with the quotation above from *Comenius*, and with the extract from the Life of Abp. Sharp, in the note on page 51 it will be plainly seen that the Bohemians not only were not *Presbyterian*, but certainly were *Episcopal*, and that Dr. Miller might as well have distinctly said so.

You may now judge, with what propriety I insisted, in the *Letter to the Editors of the American Presbyterian* that "the Waldenses had episcopacy established among them."

Let us now examine the testimony which Dr. M. adduces to show that the Waldenses were not, at any period of their history, *Episcopalians*, but were always *Presbyterians*. He quotes or refers to *Eneas Sylvius*, *Medina*, *Bellarmino*, *Perrin*, *Moreland*, *Rainolds*, *Scott*, *Heylin*, *Locke*, and *Comenius*, and says that "*all these witnesses were prelatists*." Is Dr. Miller indeed serious in this declaration? He well knows that the first three were *Roman Catholics*, and yet he seems to desire that his readers should understand them to be *prelatists*, in the sense in which he applies that term to the members of our *Protestant* church! What are we to think of the candor or justice of such a representation? *Perrin* was a *Waldensian*, and he cites him to show that *they* were *Presbyterians*, yet he too is here called a *prelatist*! *Sir Samuel Moreland*, was a *Presbyterian*, employed by Oliver Cromwell, as his agent among the Waldenses, yet Dr. M. calls him too a *prelatist*! And did he not know that

the family of *Locke* were dissenters; and that, though he was connected with the English church through a portion of his life, yet, he never expressed an attachment to episcopacy, but rather the contrary? How then can he be called a *prelatist*? *Rainolds*, was a *puritan*, but no Episcopalian, as Dr. M's. quotation from him would be quite sufficient to prove; and yet he too is now a *prelatist*! Of the whole number, *Heylin* and *Comenius* are the only two who have ever, I believe, in any sense *advocated* the principle of protestant Episcopacy; and yet, when it will in some way, serve Dr. Miller's *purpose*, they are all—all prelatists!

And now let us notice the *manner* in which he cites them, and the value of their testimony.

He quotes *Eneas Sylvius* as saying, that the Waldenses "deny the hierarchy; maintaining that there is no difference among priests, by reason of dignity of office." This is another specimen of his own manner of quoting. *Allix* and *Jones*, severally quote the passage thus: "They hold that *the pope of Rome is not superior to the bishops*, and that there is no difference as to rank and dignity among *priests*." *Bresse* quotes it in nearly the same manner. (See page 47.) This passage, when fairly quoted, has a sense precisely opposite to that which Dr. Miller, by a *partial* quotation, seeks to give to it. Is it difficult then to understand, what *Eneas Sylvius*, and *Medina*, and *Bellarmino*, mean by charging the Waldenses with *denying the hierarchy*? Dr. Miller, indeed, suppresses their own explanation of what they mean by the charge; but other and honorable writers tell us that *Eneas Sylvius* says, that they denied the hierarchy by maintaining that the *Bishop of Rome is not superior to other Bishops*, and that there is no difference among priests. In what sense is this a denial that the Waldenses were Episcopal? Dr. M. says, that "no impartial man who reads the accounts of *Perrin and Moreland*, can hesitate to admit that

the Waldenses were *Presbyterians* in church government;” but yet he adds, “I know that a different construction is put, by some, on their account; but in my opinion, by *the blindest prejudice.*” This is Dr. Miller’s gentle and charitable mode of admitting that there are persons who think differently from him on the subject, and is sufficient of itself to cause candid readers to distrust his judgment. The fact is, that though Perrin was one of the Waldensian ministers, and wrote a history of their church, (which has been much censured by later writers for its many errors,) yet it is believed that there is no unequivocal expression in it, from which a fair inference can be drawn in favor, either of episcopacy, or presbyterianism. Sir S. Moreland was himself a *Presbyterian*, and visited Piedmont *after* the plague, and when the French and Swiss Calvinistic ministers had charge of the churches; he could not therefore be expected to see ought like episcopacy among them; and copying Perrin, even in his errors, is not to be elevated above him as authority.—Dr. Miller’s next witness is Dr. *Rainolds*, whom he calls “an eminently learned Episcopal divine.” Dr. M. quotes him as saying, that “all those who have for five hundred years past endeavored the reformation of the church, have taught that all pastors, whether called Bishops, or priests, are invested with equal authority and power: as first *the Waldenses*, next Marcius Petavinus; Wickliffe and his disciples; *Huss and the Hussites,*” &c. To this, it is sufficient to reply, in the language of Dr. Bowden, in reference to the same assertion: “Very well. Rainolds was as liable to mistake as Dr. Miller. What either asserts, in opposition to numerous and positive testimonies, has not the weight of a feather in the scale of evidence.” It is amazing, that, in the face of his quotation, Dr. Miller should call him an Episcopalian. Dr. Miller himself admits, in his *Treatise on the office of Ruling Elder*, that the churches of Bohemia,

who, Mosheim says, were descended from the *better sort of Hussites*, were *not* strictly Presbyterian; nay, more, he proves in the quotation which I have made from this same work above, (p. 54) the existence of a decided *imparity* among them.—It is very obvious from the testimony which I have adduced above, in relation to the actual episcopacy of the Waldenses, that Mr. *Scott*, Dr. Miller's next witness—probably, from not being aware of their occasional substitution of other terms for that of Bishop—must have misconceived *Maurel*, the Waldensian pastor, when he understands him as saying in a letter, that the orders of Bishops, priests, and deacons, did not exist in their ministry. Scott's work is not, however, within my reach at present.—Dr. M. next extracts from *Locke's* works, a statement, that it was said by some one—in reply to a very correct assertion of a Bishop of Winchester, that “there was no christian church before Calvin that had not Bishops”—that “the Albigenses (Waldenses) had no Bishops.” As the debates in the House of Lords, in which these remarks were made, occurred as late as 1675, near half a century after the change of discipline introduced by the French and Swiss ministers, it was doubtless true: the Waldenses and Albigenses had *then* no Bishops. But Dr. M. quotes *Locke* himself as remarking on this discussion, that “it was very true what the Bishop of Winchester replied, that they [the Albigenses] had some among them *who alone had power to ordain*; but that was only to commit that power to the wisest and gravest among them, and to secure ill and unfit men from being admitted to the ministry; but they exercised no jurisdiction over the others.” But surely *Locke* ought to have added, that this *power* committed to the wisest and gravest men, was so committed by special election and ordination, for such was the fact; and that this fact, though it does not prove the existence of such a hierarchy as was then, and still is in England, yet establishes the

existence of a simple, *primitive Episcopacy*, in *three* orders; by what name soever the superior, or ordaining order, may be called, and whether with greater or less jurisdiction. That it had *some* jurisdiction I have shown above from *Bresse*; and the express language of so diligent and accurate a historian as *Mosheim*, in regard to a matter of fact, is sufficient quite to overturn the construction or inference of *Locke* in relation to it.—From his next witness, *Comenius*, *Dr. Miller* makes no quotation. The quotations from him above (p.49–50) will sufficiently show that his testimony is decidedly adverse to *Dr. M's* opinion. Yet, as showing upon what varied testimony *Dr. M.* is willing to rely, and as furnishing a contrast, almost ludicrous, when we remember *Dr. M's* object in citing them, let us view his last three witnesses together. He represents *Locke* as saying, “that they had some among them who *alone* had the power to ordain”—*Comenius*, as saying *expressly* that they had “certain *Seniors* [so called] who performed certain duties [ordination] for the sake of order”—and *Heylin*, that they had fallen upon a “way of ordaining ministers among themselves, *without* having recourse to the Bishop, or *any such* superior officer as a superintendant.” Is *Dr. M.* incapable of seeing that such discordant testimonies as these can be of no service in testifying to a matter of fact? And yet he speaks of a “marvellous harmony among these learned and unbiassed witnesses.” I marvel much where he finds that harmony, and so, I doubt not, will my readers!

You can now judge what reliance can be placed on *Dr. Miller's* testimony against the episcopacy of the Waldenses; and whether that fact is not as well attested as any in history.

VIII. To *Dr. Miller's* last topic, I do not see that any reply is required other than the speedy publication, and extensive circulation of the volume to which it refers—Bishop *Onder-*

donk's *Episcopacy tested by Scripture*, and the various replies and rejoinders it called forth. Dr. M. meant, undoubtedly, to be very severe in the expression of his opinion, respecting what he is pleased to call my "singular gasconade." But Dr. M's. *opinion* on any subject connected with episcopacy, will, I think, not have much weight with those who have accompanied me thus far, in the examination of his arguments and proofs. It is, however, singular in him to be found concurring at all with Episcopalians in relation to episcopacy; and as both parties seem satisfied with this proposed publication of their several arguments; although, as in some former cases of the kind, the work of editing and publishing is left to Episcopalians; it is hoped that it will be generally read, and thoroughly understood by all who read it.

These eight points are all, in reference to the *Letter*, which Dr. M. conceived to call for his attention. I pointed out in the *Letter* numerous inconsistencies in opinions, and statements, and arguments, of which he has noticed those only on which, as he confesses, he has been often pressed,—his opinions of, and quotations from, Ignatius. He has not at all attempted to vindicate himself from the inconsistency of disallowing *Theodore's* testimony in relation to a fact in primitive history, because he was distant four centuries from the fact— and yet quoting Dr. *Barrow*, who lived sixteen centuries later, as authority in reference to the same fact—or of denying, in the words of Barrow, that the *apostolical office* was at all *successive*, and yet professedly quoting Ignatius to show, that presbyters *were* the successors to "*the bench of the apostles*"—*nor*, to mention no others, the following; which, that it may be more plainly seen, I now place in parallel columns:—Dr. Miller says, in relation to the ministry—

In his Tract 1835.

The scripture testimony of our Episcopal brethren is in no one instance *direct* and *explicit*, but all indirect and remotely inferential.—p. 55.

Again:

They (Episcopalians) do not pretend to quote a single passage of scripture which declares *in so many words, or any thing like it*, in favor of their claim, but their whole reliance in regard to scriptural testimony, is placed on *facts* and *deductions from those facts*.—*Ib.*

In his Letters on Ministry 1805 & 30.

Whoever expects to find *any formal or explicit* declarations on this subject, delivered by Christ or his apostles, will be *disappointed*.—p. 26.

Again:

While the scriptures present *no formal or explicit directions* on this subject, we find in them a *mode of expression*, and a *number of facts*, from which we may *without difficulty*, ascertain the outlines of the apostolic plan of church order.—p. 27.

These, certainly, are gross inconsistencies; and if Dr. M. wishes that his opinions and arguments should have weight with men to whom principle is of more value than party, it largely behoves him to explain them. All his railing at my ignorance or incompetency, will not remove the impressions which such discrepancies are calculated to make on men who are really impartial, and love the truth.

Had not sufficient been already alleged to show the disposition of Dr. Miller in relation to the Episcopal church, I might proceed to a much greater extent in the collection of facts from his own writings. Yet I cannot avoid a few additional remarks, in reference to the manner which this gentleman has so long accustomed himself to exhibit towards those who differ from him, that it is, perhaps, now not easy to himself to be aware of it. Notwithstanding the earnest love of peace, which he professes to inculcate, at the close of the article in the American Presbyterian which has occasioned this *Letter*, he has been more engaged in theological controversies, than, perhaps, any other man of our age and country; and has never, I believe, passed by any plausible occasion for a controversy with Episcopalians, or on the subject of episcopacy. In every instance, I believe

without exception, his opponents have complained of his singularly positive and dogmatical manner; of his negligence in making quotations; and of his general want of candor towards an adversary. He appears to consider it as a conceded and settled principle, that he alone, of all men, is placed on the pinnacle of truth, beyond the possibility of error, or of correction. He very seldom, if at all, manifests any respect whatever for the opinions of those who differ from him. If they charge him with error, misconception, misquotation, or inconsistency, however plain may be the testimony, the charge is a *slander*. If they take a different view of any facts or opinions from his, it is only by the *blindest prejudice*. If any historical fact is alleged to have been stated by authors, even of established reputation, in a way to militate with any theory of his, they are not *candid or well informed men*; are of *bad faith*, or *little reflection*:* the very language—the identical expressions which he himself applies to the systems or doctrines of others, when applied to his own, are *unsparing calumny—blind and unhallowed abuse*.† He freely applies such terms as *bigots, de-*

*See his *Tract on Presbyterianism*, p. 31, and also his Letter to a Gentleman of Baltimore in reference to the case of the Rev. Mr. Duncan.

†In his *Tract on Presbyterianism*, p. 24, speaking of the Calvinistic system of religious doctrine, he says: “It has been by multitudes defamed, as an abominable system, revolting to every dictate of reason, *dishonorable to God*; *unfriendly to christian comfort*; adapted to beget discouragement and despair on the one hand, or presumption and licentiousness on the other.” He terms this, and such like language, “*unsparing calumny*”—“*blind and unhallowed abuse*.”—Yet in his *Continuation of his Letters on the Ministry* p. 338, he says of the Anti-Calvinistic system, that “it is inconsistent with itself, *dishonorable to God, and comfortless to man*.” How remarkable is the correspondence between these expressions and those which he *complains* that the opponents of Calvinism are in the habit of applying to his creed!

luded, sectarian, profoundly ignorant, disgraceful, narrow views, sinister purpose, abettors of popish doctrine, ruffian, insolence, falsehood and meanness, upon his opponents, and yet complains of *personal indecorums* towards himself.* He may term the pretensions of Episcopalians in regard to the ministry an *imposition upon popular credulity*—he may declare that their religious doctrines lead to *blank and cheerless atheism*—that they are *quite as likely to land the believer in the abyss of the damned as in the paradise of God*, and none must deny, object to, or complain of such bitter imputations and proscriptions; but a word in behalf of episcopacy—the assertion that it was exclusively of apostolic origin—is an *unchurching* of the residue of the christian world, and casting them out to *uncovenanted mercy*.—He may represent episcopacy as the *idol of highchurch men; to the worship of which they are willing to give their days and nights*, and themselves *unwearied worshipers of sect*, but any attempt to disprove, or evade the effect of such imputations, is *misrepresentation, slander, and vengeance!*

In the article which I have now been employed in noticing, published as it was in a religious paper, edited by highly respectable gentlemen, he does not scruple to apply, nor they to publish in reference to me, many of the expressions above quoted. He accuses me of having *lent myself to the propa-*

*Let us observe how he regards such language when applied to himself. In the dissensions, which have for some time past prevailed in his own church, some of these terms have been annexed to his name. In his *Letters to the Presbyterians* (1833) he writes thus on the subject: “To call a man *bigoted*, a *sectarian*, or a *high-churchman*, because he decisively *prefers* to all others the church to which he has solemnly pledged his membership and his affection: and to insist that he is *equally bound to approve*, and *equally bound to sustain*, all other denominations;—is as perfect an affront to common sense, as it is to every sober ecclesiastical principle.”

gation of slander; of being actuated by a spirit of *vengeance*:—he compares me to a *ruffian*;—he intimates that the course pursued towards him is *a compound of insolence, falsehood and meanness, deserving the indignation of every decent man*; he charges me with *profound ignorance*—with having repeated a charge, which (though previously made against him by accomplished and pious scholars), was adapted to *disgrace myself*:—he calls me a *reckless adversary*:—he intimates that I have *not intelligence enough to understand the plainest sentence, &c.*

It was in consequence of his frequent and continued exhibitions of such feelings, and of a conduct towards his opponents so ungenerous, and unbecoming his profession as a minister of the Gospel, that it was said of him, more than ten years since, by one of his opponents, who was not an Episcopalian, that “of all the theological writers of the present time, in this country, he has the distinction of being the most bitterly and perseveringly illiberal; we know not of what kind of fame he may be ambitious, but if he continues much longer in the course which he is pursuing, he will be regarded by all the moderate and judicious, and he will go down to posterity, as *the arch bigot of his day*. If that is a reputation which he covets he is in a fair way of acquiring it.”

His exertions to this end do not appear to have been intermitted since that period.

Whether you shall adopt this judgment of Dr. Miller, or not, I am confident you will approve the expression, with which I conclude, of my determination to take no further notice of the productions of Dr. Miller’s controversial pen.

December, 1835.



Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01185 8059



